



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 17, 2004

No. 69

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 17, 2004.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS E. PETRI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) for 5 minutes.

VOTE FOR H.R. 3722, UNDOCUMENTED ALIEN EMERGENCY MEDICAL ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 2004

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, today the American people should pay close attention to the debate when the House takes up H.R. 3722. If one is concerned about the flood of illegal immigrants pouring into our country, this is the debate to watch. And H.R. 3722 is the vote on which to judge your Member of Congress.

There has obviously been a conscious decision made by certain powerful peo-

ple that massive immigration into the United States, legal or illegal, is good for America or at least good for certain friendly interest groups. This vote on H.R. 3722 is clear-cut. The American people can determine who is on their side and who will channel our scarce health care dollars to illegal immigrants, thus encouraging even more illegal immigration into our country.

H.R. 3722, which will come for debate here later today and will be voted on tomorrow, is designed to undo the harm done by an amendment that was slipped into the Medicare bill that was passed just a few months ago. That surprise and somewhat covert amendment established a \$1 billion fund to reimburse American hospitals for the emergency care they provide illegal immigrants.

The perverse, unintended consequences of this are easy to predict. Americans and legal residents who lack health insurance will be sent to the back of the line when seeking help for a medical emergency because the hospitals will naturally give primary service to those illegal immigrants whose tab is being picked up by the Federal taxpayers. This is a travesty.

Anyone voting against H.R. 3722 is voting to put our kids, voting to put our seniors, at the end of a long waiting line moving the illegal immigrant to the front of the line. At this time when we cannot afford the money to pay for prescription drugs for our seniors, we are going to be spending \$1 billion to treat people who have come here illegally.

Those against H.R. 3722 are voting to spend our limited health care money to make America the HMO of the world. And then they act surprised when even more tens of millions of illegals flood into our country.

Watch the vote on H.R. 3722. Listen to the arguments. The other side will claim that the legislation causes hospitals more paperwork. That is a bogus

argument. However, the public will decide when they are listening to the debate whether they are hearing legitimate arguments or whether it is simply noise being generated to confuse people so they will not know who is ripping off their health care dollars and giving it to strangers.

The flood of illegal immigration has already had horrible impacts on our society, on working Americans and middle-class Americans in particular. Wages are being kept down. Our educational and criminal justice systems are deteriorating. And, yes, our health care system is failing.

A government's first responsibility is protecting our citizens and, yes, our legal residents, not to provide benefits and services to anyone in the rest of the world who can get here. Our responsibility is to the people of the United States and the legal residents here of the United States. Our responsibility is not to the rest of the world and to provide any benefits that we can't provide to our American people, to provide them to anyone in the world who can get here. That will break our bank. If we are going to try to do everything for everybody, we are not going to be able to do anything for anybody, even our own people.

H.R. 3722 is the litmus test. There is always a good sounding excuse for voting against any bill that tries to come up and tries to come to grips with the out-of-control flood of illegals coming into our country. But the issue is clear in H.R. 3722: Are America's limited health care dollars going to treat illegal immigrants rather than being used to treat our own people?

Members of Congress need to hear from their constituents. H.R. 3722 is a first good step in stemming the tide of illegal immigrants into our country. It will be debated here in just a few hours. America should pay attention.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3019

UNDER REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP CONGRESS IS A QUICKSAND OF IDEOLOGY AND INTRANSIGENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, in February, the former majority leader in this House, Dick Armey, stated the obvious: "I am sitting here and I am upset about the deficit, and I am upset about spending," said the former Republican leader. And he added, "There is no way I can pin that on the Democrats. Republicans own the town now."

Yes, they do, Mr. Speaker, the House, the Senate, and the White House. Yet, under Republican leadership this Congress has become a quicksand of ideology and intransigence that is swallowing up America's priorities and performing a disservice to the American people.

The annual budget is a blueprint of our Nation's priorities and values. But with a Memorial Day recess approaching and the April 15 budget deadline long passed, House Republicans have tied the process in knots.

They refuse to pay for tax cuts even as they have run up the largest budget deficit and deficits as far as the eye can see in American history.

Republicans' intraparty bickering continues to get in the way of other priorities. In addition to the budget, two job creation bills, a tax measure for domestic manufacturing called the FSC/ETI bill, and a major transportation bill have been stymied, held up, not moving since last year. The transportation bill could create millions of jobs in a tough job market, and the FSC bill would end harmful European Union sanctions against struggling American manufacturers. Both of these bills could have been passed, should have been passed last year with broad support in both Houses of Congress. But with House Republicans it is my way or the highway.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle have even rejected progress on an issue that has broad bipartisan support, tax cuts for the middle-class and working families. They have done so not once, not twice, but three times in 3 weeks. And they are poised to do so for a fourth time this week.

By refusing to offset the cost of their tax bills, Republicans are not only endangering support for tax cuts which Members on both sides want to see become law, but also putting themselves on record in favor of placing an enormous debt tax on future generation of American children.

House Republican leaders may be content with inertia in the people's House. Democrats are not.

Last week the Washington Post shined a light on the Republican strategy of biding their time until the election. The Post story observed that, and I quote, "Despite the burgeoning scandal over U.S. treatment of Iraqi pris-

oners and persistent concerns about the economy and the deficit, the House has been keeping banking hours." Frankly, the bank would be bankrupt if it kept our hours.

In contrast to Republican leaders of the other body, House Republican leaders have refused to fully investigate the abuse of Iraqi prisoners. This is just the latest example of an abdication of this body's constitutional responsibility to oversee the executive branch.

Even a prominent Republican from the other body has said, and I quote, "We Republicans have never quite reached the level of competent oversight that the Democrats developed over their 40 years that they controlled Congress."

He continued, major Republican leader, "We tried to emphasize legislating and we have delegated so much authority to the executive branch of government and we ought to devote more time to oversight than we do."

This House must not abdicate its constitutional responsibility as an independent, coequal branch of government. Failure in this regard is not an option.

Failure is not an option in Iraq. And Democrats will support the funding necessary to support our troops and finish the job. But we want to see where that money is spent, how it is spent, and how effectively it is being used. But there is absolutely no question that Democrats as well as Republicans should want to hold this administration accountable for how it is spending tens of billions of taxpayer dollars in so many different areas.

As a senior member of the Committee on Appropriations, Mr. Speaker, I will continue my efforts to attach accountability to the billions of dollars being spent on the war in Iraq. There are no checks and no balances in Washington today. Right now we need to focus on the oversight responsibility that our Founding Fathers expected, particularly the people's House, to exercise.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, that notwithstanding the performance of the first 5 months, we will soon see such responsibility exercised.

SECRETARY RUMSFELD MUST GO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, what the administration said and did not say removes any doubt: Secretary Rumsfeld must go.

A Los Angeles Times story dated May 12, which I will enter into the RECORD, may prove to be the defining moment when the administration could no longer hide behind the PR spin because their own words were spinning out of control.

Not only did this administration fail to tell Congress about the prisoner abuse in Iraq, it also failed to tell the United States Supreme Court at a time and a place when it should have. On the very day that CBS News first broadcast pictures of prisoner abuse, the administration stood before the United States Supreme Court. The case involved the rights of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay.

The administration claims that prisoners held in Cuba are enemy combatants who can be held indefinitely without charges and without the protection of the Geneva Convention. The Deputy Solicitor General representing the United States invoked the "Trust us" defense in urging the Nation's highest court to side with the President.

The lawyer did not know about the abuses in Iraq and the photos, but his client, Rumsfeld's Department of War knew, and said nothing. The Supreme Court, like the rest of America, like the entire world, was kept in the dark.

On the very day that the prisoner abuse pictures were first shown, a lawyer for the administration stood before the Supreme Court and said only the executive branch should have the power to decide the fate of detainees.

In response to that line of reasoning, Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg asked, "Suppose the executive says mild torture will help get a little information?" The question was asked with no knowledge that torture had been used in Iraq. What answer did the administration's lawyer give Justice Ginsburg? The Deputy Solicitor General told the court that abuses would be a crime.

The Supreme Court justice asked the attorney to elaborate on his remarks. The administration attorney said, quote, "Our executive does not commit such abuses." The administration's attorney added, and again I quote, "You have to recognize that in situations where there is a war, where the government is on war footing, then you have to trust the executive."

"Trust us." Well, Mr. Speaker, America did and look what happened. At last count 1,600 pictures of prisoner abuse have scarred the Nation and shocked the world. Instead of full disclosure, the administration remains in full denial. The President says the Secretary is doing a superb job. Superb job of what? Destroying our credibility overseas? Demoralizing the American people? Denying that soldiers follow orders?

The administration says, "Trust us," then blames a handful of low-ranking soldiers instead of looking up the chain of command, right up to the very top.

"Trust us." Well, Mr. Speaker, America did, and the administration sent soldiers off to war without adequate body armor.

"Trust us." Well, Mr. Speaker, America did, and the administration unilaterally told thousands of soldiers they were staying in Iraq instead of coming home as they were promised.

"Trust us." Mr. President, we did and look what happened.

We are fresh out of trust, Mr. Speaker, in America, and around the world. It is time for Rumsfeld to go before we try and hand off sovereignty to the Iraqis. They will never be able to deal with our Secretary of war because nobody trusts him.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I will insert into the RECORD the newspaper article I referred to earlier.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 12, 2004]
ABUSE FLAP MAY RUIN BUSH TEAM'S "TRUST US" ARGUMENT ON DETAINEES

WASHINGTON.—The photos of abused Iraqi prisoners not only have shaken the Bush administration but also may have ruined its Supreme Court defense of its handling of terrorism suspects, some legal experts say.

"Their argument has been 'trust us,' and that argument has been deeply undermined," said Yale University professor Harold Koh, an international law specialist who served in the Clinton administration.

Before the court last month, the administration argued that the president and his military commanders have exclusive power to decide the fate of those captured in the war on terrorism.

The court has yet to rule.

Shortly after U.S. troops invaded Afghanistan, the administration declared that people captured there and shipped to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, were not entitled to the protections of the Geneva Conventions: They were not prisoners of war but rather "unlawful enemy combatants," falling outside both international law and U.S. law.

International legal specialists criticized this decision to create "a law-free zone." The Supreme Court surprised the Bush administration by taking up the issue.

During arguments April 28, administration lawyers told the court that, in wartime, the federal courts have no power to hear claims from the imprisoned men. Only the executive branch should decide their fate.

"Suppose the executive says mild torture will help get information?" asked Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg.

Committing such "an atrocity" against a prisoner would be a crime punishable by court-martial, replied Deputy Solicitor General Paul Clement.

When pressed further, he added, "our executive doesn't" commit such abuses. "You have to recognize that in situations where there is a war . . . you have to trust the executive."

That same evening, CBS aired the first photos of soldiers mistreating Iraqi prisoners. Two days later, the Supreme Court justices began working on their opinions in the case.

"In a close and difficult case like this, this could tip the scales," said Michael J. Glennon, an international law specialist at Tufts University. "The overriding issue in these cases has been to what extent can you trust the executive to police itself."

A former Bush administration lawyer who advised the White House on wartime issues said the Iraqi prison scandal should have no effect on the court's decision.

"It is a false analogy. These are two separate and different kinds of detainees," said John C. Yoo, a law professor.

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE DONALD RUMSFELD SHOULD RESIGN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized

during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend my hometown newspaper, the Asbury Park Press, ran an editorial calling on Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld to resign. It was a stunning criticism from a newspaper that is not known to be partisan. And I would like to take this opportunity to simply read the editorial.

"The United States needs to send this message to the world. We remain a civilized Nation. We respect international law. We respect the dignity of all individuals. We will at all times abide by the Geneva Convention governing the humane conduct of prisoner of war and apply that standard to all detainees.

"We hold ourselves to the highest moral standards and will not tolerate those who do not. And we will hold our leaders accountable when our conduct falls short. That message should be accompanied by the resignation of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld. If he is not asked to resign by President Bush, he should do the honorable thing and step down on his own.

"The case against Rumsfeld, who has overseen the conduct of the war in Iraq, transcends the prisoner abuses at Abu Ghraib, but the scandal is an important element of it. The photos and accounts of the treatment of Iraqi detainees at the hands of American soldiers have shocked and disgusted Americans and the world. They have brought the realities of war whose daily horrors have largely been kept from public view into the national consciousness. They have shown that we are not immune from committing evil acts.

"Over the past 2 years the International Red Cross, Human Rights Watch, and Amnesty International have all raised concerns about patterns of mistreatment of detainees by U.S. interrogators in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Guantanamo Bay. Rumsfeld's explanations for how the abuses were allowed to occur and how they escaped his attention for so long have not been convincing. Punishing only those directly responsible for the inhumane actions is not enough, not given the gravity of the offenses and the damage they have done to our Nation's reputation and our ability to win the war of ideas in the Arab world.

"There are many other reasons why it should be in America's best interest for Rumsfeld to step aside. As Defense Secretary he has mismanaged the war in Iraq every step of the way. He helped sell the idea that Saddam Hussein was working in concert with al Qaeda and posed a clear nuclear and biological threat to the United States. He ignored the advice of many of our long-standing allies and top Pentagon officials to continue what had been a successful strategy of isolating Saddam while continuing our search for weapons of mass destruction.

"Rumsfeld failed to anticipate the hostile reception we received following

the 'liberation.' He miscalculated the troop strength needed to stabilize the country. He left Baghdad and other major cities unprotected from looters and thugs. He left museums, hospitals, government ministries and facilities essential to a functioning civil society unguarded. He failed to provide the necessary support and manpower and material for our military. And he allowed our military prisons to operate with inadequate staffing, training, and oversight.

"After the fall of Baghdad, instead of trying to internationalize the occupation and the rebuilding effort, Rumsfeld and other administration leaders chose to go it alone, putting virtually all the costs associated with the occupation, financial and human, on American soldiers.

"To date more than 770 American soldiers have died in Iraq. Another 4,100 have been wounded. We have committed more than \$160 billion to the invasion, occupation, and reconstruction of Iraq. Estimates suggest the cost could easily reach \$600 billion even if the June 30 deadline for handing over political control to the Iraqis is met—a dubious proposition.

"Our leaders in Washington need to send a clear message to the world that we have not abandoned our ideals. Rumsfeld's resignation would help underscore the point. More important, our leaders need to reinforce that message with the American people who are growing increasingly fearful that we have lost our way."

That is the end of the editorial, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say that I totally associate myself with the Asbury Park Press editorial. I think they are absolutely right. I do not think anybody has ever said it so well.

Mr. Speaker, I recently called on Secretary Rumsfeld to resign and I would urge my colleagues to do the same. Next, I would urge the President to take immediate steps to internationalize this conflict and build a strong coalition of partners in Iraq. The President should convene an immediate international summit on Iraq. The United States must go in with a plan that provides for new international arrangements to manage the political security and economic aspects of Iraq's transitions, and includes reorienting American policy to reflect those new international arrangements. We cannot simply continue to go it alone. We must internationalize this conflict. And I think that has also been a major part of what the Asbury Park Press says in this editorial.

THE WORK HABITS OF THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, before I begin on my text I

want to just correct the minority whip, the Democratic whip. He is a man with whom I have a great deal of agreement. But I think he was wrong when he said the rigid ideology of the people in power today leads them to the view, my way or the highway.

I wish that were the case. Mr. Speaker, as you well know from your own committee position, the right wing ideology are on the point of saying, my way instead of the highway. Because so rigid are they in their right-wing ideology that we cannot even get a highway bill passed this year, as we certainly should, in the interest of the transportation needs of this country and the economy.

But I want to talk beyond that about the work habits of the President. It is clear that in addition to an excessively rigid ideology we have an administration which is not very competent in a lot of things. I do not think we have seen a more incompetently executed national security policy of a major sort than Iraq in our history.

And I wonder why we get such poor execution, even given that I disagree with some of the things they are trying to execute. Now it does become clear one of the problems may be the President's work habits.

On December 16 in an interview on ABC News with Diane Sawyer, the President boasted about how he does not need to read the newspapers or, presumably, watch television. He gets his information, he says, from members of his administration. When Diane Sawyer said, "Is it just hard to read constant criticism?" He interjected, "Why even put up with it when you get the facts elsewhere? I am a lucky man," the President said. "I have got, it is not just Condi and Andy, it is all kinds of people in my administration who are charged with different responsibilities. And they come in and say this is what is happening, this is not what is happening."

Well, Mr. President, you are being ill served by this refusal to get independent sources of information. You got a lot of people who confuse what is happening with what is not happening and sometimes they do not tell you anything.

Most recently we have the Secretary of Defense who forgot to tell you that we had a major debilitating problem coming up with regard to the mistreatment of prisoners. And he did not tell you that.

Last year, in what I think you consider to be, Mr. President, the single most important domestic accomplishment in the administration, did someone forget to tell you that the bill you were telling us was going to cost \$400 billion over 10 years was, in fact, going to cost \$540 billion and that all of the additional billion would go to the providers and none of it to the recipients? Did someone forget to tell the President or did the President forget to tell us?

Then, of course, we have the comment by CIA Director George Tenet

who told the President apparently that it was a slam-dunk that there were weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Well, once again, we have a case on a very important issue of the President and, to quote his words, all kinds of people in my administration were charged with different responsibilities and they would come in and say this is what is happening and this is not what is happening.

There is a serious problem, Mr. President. The time has come for the President of the United States to admit an error in this case, I know he does not like to do that, to admit that relying on Secretary Rumsfeld or CIA Director Tenet or Secretary Thompson or a whole range of other people to give him the information to brag about how he eschews independent, factual sources is a great mistake and may explain some of the serious mistakes this administration has made.

Old sayings sometimes can be overdone. Sometimes they have some truth. There is a saying that ignorance is bliss. Well, Mr. Speaker, there may be context in which ignorance is bliss, but the Presidency of the United States is not one of them.

The time has come for the President to acknowledge the fact that his method of getting information only from people within his own administration, who may have their own motives for misrepresenting or not giving him information that might be embarrassing to them, that that has broken down, and the time has come for the President to dip into the budget that he gets and buy a subscription to some newspapers and watch the TV news.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert into the RECORD at this point the excerpt from the interview with Diane Sawyer.

DIANE SAWYER. First of all, I just want to ask about reading. Mr. President, you know that there was a great deal of reporting about the fact that you said, first of all, that you let Condoleezza Rice and Andrew Card give you a flavor of what's in the news.

PRESIDENT BUSH. Yes.

DIANE SAWYER. That you don't read the stories yourself.

PRESIDENT BUSH. Yes. I get my news from people who don't editorialize. They give me the actual news, and it makes it easier to digest, on a daily basis, the facts.

DIANE SAWYER. Is it just harder to read constant criticism or to read—

PRESIDENT BUSH. Why even put up with it when you can get the facts elsewhere? I'm a lucky man. I've got, it's not just Condi and Andy, it's all kinds of people in my administration who are charged with different responsibilities, and they come in and say this is what's happening, this isn't what's happening.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members should bear in mind that remarks in debate should be addressed to the Chair and not to others as in the second person.

THE HOUSE SHOULD NOT PASS H.R. 3722, UNDOCUMENTED ALIEN EMERGENCY MEDICAL ASSIST- ANCE AMENDMENTS OF 2004

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 20, 2004, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, we heard earlier from the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) his sentiments regarding H.R. 3722. This item is on suspension and will be coming up before us. It is known as the Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments. That title is somewhat misleading because, in fact, what it requires is that our local hospitals turn into what I see as law enforcement agencies and INS agents, INS Immigration Service agents that would soon be asking people who may look or appear as though they are undocumented to provide some proof or verification that they are, in fact, full citizens of the United States.

We do not do that in our schools. Why do we have to do that in our hospitals, especially when people are already fearful of coming forward to, say, a local hospital and having to fill out forms and then being told that, well, you do not qualify because you are not a U.S. citizen or you are undocumented therefore we are going to call the INS or Homeland Security and deport you?

What kind of fear does that place in a community?

Well, I can tell you in a community like mine in Los Angeles, California, where the make-up of my district is largely Hispanic or Latino, that is not to say that they are all undocumented and that is not to say that they do not work and pay taxes; in fact, on the average I would say that the local immigrants in our communities pay about \$1,300 in taxes. They do not get that money back in some cases because they may not be documented. We know that. That has been happening here in the U.S.

But they pay into our tax base system whether it is to go down and buy a gallon of gas at \$2.40 or \$2.50 a gallon now in Los Angeles, if they go down and buy goods at the market or Home Depot, they are paying sales tax. All that then goes into our piggy bank, so to speak, for the government. That money then is set aside for public health care institutions and private health care institutions.

I would like to tell you that in my district alone I received letters from some of our private-for-profit hospitals that were adamantly opposed to this piece of legislation because they see it again as something that is going to provide another layer of bureaucracy. It will make them become INS agents. They will have to fingerprint, photograph, take digital photos and keep files for 5 years on anyone that they believe may be undocumented.

And I have to tell you that the kind of feeling that I get when I hear about

this type of legislation is one that reminds me of what occurred in California back a few years ago. There was an initiative that was proposed by the governor then, Pete Wilson, Proposition 187, that would bar undocumented families and people, children, from going to school and also receiving health care assistance.

And what that means to many of us in our communities is if a child comes into a classroom and, say, may have an illness or disease, they are not going to be able to get treated. They are not going to be able to go down to the hospital and get immunized and they will not get the kind of treatment that right now they are able to get.

If they do not, what will happen is whatever contagious disease they might have is going to somehow not discriminate against the next student who sits next to him, whether you are a citizen or not, but, in fact, that disease will be spread.

Why is it that we want to move in a direction that would create more fear and anxiety in our communities when I think we have the current tools in place right now that were actually passed by this House that would provide sufficient services for people who need it?

And I just want to clarify one thing. There are many undocumented people in this country, they are not all Hispanic. Many come from Europe, many come from Canada, many come from Asian, Indonesian countries as well. And maybe we do not somehow feel that their presence is well known, but we know that they are there. They clean our houses, they sometimes even clean the hospitals that we go to, they pick our lettuce and our fruits that we eat on the table, they also serve as janitors in our office buildings. And some of them may even work here in Washington, D.C.

But they are people, and people have to be respected. And those people, like anyone else, come to this country believing that they have a dream that can be fulfilled here.

I do not think it is too much to ask for us to say that this law is a bad law, that it would, in fact, demoralize an entire community. I do not believe that the Bush administration is supportive of this piece of legislation because why would he at the beginning of the year say that he would want to open up discussions about immigration reform and allow for people who are currently here who are not documented to be given work permits. Why would he open up that discussion and yet the same members of his party are saying no, cast those people out. They cost too much money, and they are, in fact, a burden on our public and private hospitals.

Well, I am here to tell you that there are 43 million people in the U.S. that we can account for that have no health insurance. The problems that we have with health care delivery and service does not have to be blamed on one

group of people. And I am here to tell you that we need to oppose this piece of legislation, H.R. 3722, as it comes up today for a vote before the House.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, Teacher of the ages and Eternal Guide to the leaders of nations, be ever present in the work of the House of Representatives this week. During this season of academic graduations across this country, we wish to express our gratitude to You for the academic freedom and educational resources that have been fostered by government, churches and local communities in the past. We pray that they continue to flourish and be supported to meet the needs of future generations and the demands of the times, especially in the fields of mathematics and the sciences.

Bless all the graduates of 2004. Grant them an atmosphere of security and peace so they may pursue careers that give you Glory. Provide them with opportunities for work and experiences which will draw upon their creativity and deepest commitments. Ground them in lasting values so they may stand the tests of life and one day graduate to Your eternal domain and give You glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BURGESS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Monahan, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate has passed an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1350. An act to reauthorize the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and for other purposes.

HOUSE-PASSED MEDICAL LIABILITY REFORM EXPECTED TO STALL IN OTHER BODY

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, last week in this House, we passed yet another version of the medical liability reform act in this Congress. We passed similar legislation in March 2003. That bill that we passed last year and likely the bill that we pass this year is going to stop dead on the other side of the Capitol and will not be enacted.

It is a shame, Mr. Speaker. Right now we have a President in the White House who has said he will sign this bill into law if it is given to him. We have a candidate running for the office of President who has either voted "no" or been absent when that vote has come up across the rotunda on the other side of the Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, this is important. I met with a group of doctors back in my district this weekend. There is no greater peril to our profession of medicine than the current medical justice system. The reforms that we have passed in this House closely mirror the Medical Injury Compensation Reform Act of 1975 passed in the State of California that has brought some semblance of sanity back to the medical justice system in that State. Residents of the other States, physicians in the other States, and their patients deserve no less.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken after 6:30 p.m. today.

BEND PINE NURSERY LAND CONVEYANCE ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3505) to amend the Bend Pine Nursery Land Conveyance Act to specify the recipients and consideration for conveyance of the Bend Pine Nursery, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3505

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. MODIFICATION OF BEND PINE NURSERY LAND CONVEYANCE.

(a) DESIGNATION OF RECIPIENTS AND CONSIDERATION.—Section 3 of the Bend Pine Nursery Land Conveyance Act (Public Law 106-526; 114 Stat. 2512) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraphs (2) through (7) as paragraphs (1) through (6), respectively;

(2) in subsection (e)—

(A) by striking “this section” both places it appears and inserting “subsection (a)”;

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking “Subject to paragraph (3), the” and inserting “The”; and

(C) by striking paragraph (3); and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsections:

“(g) CONVEYANCE OF BEND PINE NURSERY.—

“(1) CONVEYANCE TO PARK AND RECREATION DISTRICT.—Upon receipt of consideration in the amount of \$3,505,676 from the Bend Metro Park and Recreation District in Deschutes County, Oregon, the Secretary shall convey to the Bend Metro Park and Recreation District all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a parcel of real property consisting of approximately 185 acres and containing the Bend Pine Nursery, as depicted on the site plan map entitled ‘Bend Pine Nursery Administrative Site, May 13, 2004’.

“(2) USE OF CONVEYED PROPERTY.—Subject to subsection (h), the real property conveyed to the Bend Metro Park and Recreation District under paragraph (1) shall be used only for recreation purposes and may be developed for those purposes. If the Secretary determines that the real property subject to this condition is converted, in whole or in part, to non-recreational use, the Secretary shall require the Bend Metro Park and Recreation District to pay to the United States an amount equal to the fair market value of the property at the time of conversion, less the consideration paid under this paragraph.

“(h) RECONVEYANCE OF PORTION OF BEND PINE NURSERY.—

“(1) CONVEYANCE TO SCHOOL DISTRICT.—As soon as practicable after the receipt by the Bend Metro Park and Recreation District of the real property described in subsection (g)(1), the Bend Metro Park and Recreation District shall convey to the Administrative School District No. 1, Deschutes County, Oregon, without consideration, a parcel of real property located in the northwest corner of the real property described in such subsection and consisting of approximately 15 acres.

“(2) USE OF CONVEYED PROPERTY.—The deed of conveyance under paragraph (1) shall contain a covenant requiring that the real property conveyed to the School District be used only for educational purposes.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 4(a) of such Act is amended by striking “section 3(a)” and inserting “section 3”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3505, introduced by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN), would amend the Bend Pine Nursery Land Conveyance Act to specify the recipients and consideration for conveyance of the Bend Pine Nursery, and for other purposes. This bill will bring closure to an administrative process that has already taken far too long to complete.

Specifically, the bill will convey 170 acres of the Bend Pine Nursery site to the Bend Metro Parks and Recreation District and would also convey an additional 15 acres to the Bend-La Pine School District to construct an elementary school. The bill also contains a reference to an updated Forest Service map at the request of the administration. I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague has already explained the amendment. The legislation would benefit the Bend Metro Park and Recreation District, which has had a difficult time in purchasing excess Forest Service property in Bend, Oregon. The legislation includes provisions to ensure that the property to be conveyed will only be used for recreational purposes. The legislation also would provide property to the Administrative School District No. 1 in Deschutes County, Oregon.

The gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is also to be commended for his role in securing the passage of this legislation. We have no objection.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3505, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TIMUCUAN ECOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC PRESERVE BOUNDARY REVISION ACT OF 2004

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3768) to expand the Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve, Florida, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3768

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve Boundary Revision Act of 2004”.

SEC. 2. REVISION OF BOUNDARY OF TIMUCUAN ECOLOGICAL AND HISTORIC PRESERVE, FLORIDA.

Section 201(a) of Public Law 100-249 (16 U.S.C. 698n) is amended—

(1) by striking “(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby” and inserting the following:

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) MODIFICATION OF BOUNDARY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the land described in paragraph (1), the Preserve shall include approximately 8.5 acres of land located in Nassau County, Florida, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve American Beach Adjustment’, numbered 006/80012 and dated June 2003.

“(B) DUTIES OF SECRETARY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall—

“(i) revise the boundaries of the Preserve so as to encompass the land described in subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) maintain the map described in subparagraph (A) on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3768, introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW) and amended by the Committee on Resources, would authorize the expansion of the Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve in the State of Florida by 8.5 acres. The additional land, much of it known as American Beach, would be donated by the Amelia Island Plantation Company. American Beach, established by Florida's first insurance company, the Afro-American Life Insurance Company, is the only remaining example of a beach resort established for use by African Americans during the divisive Jim Crow 1930s. In addition, the beach includes the Nana, the tallest natural dune on Amelia Island and habitat for the threatened loggerhead turtle.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3768, as amended, is supported by the majority and the minority of the committee, the Nassau

County Board of Commissioners of Florida, and the administration. I urge adoption of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3768, as amended, is a small, non-controversial measure. The legislation involves the inclusion of 8.5 acres of land within the Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve in northern Florida. This parcel of land, known as American Beach, has historical ties to the African American community, largely represented by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CORRINE BROWN), which used the area for many years for recreational purposes. It is our understanding that this non-controversial measure has the support of the local community and there are no objections from the National Park Service to the inclusion of this recreational and historical land within the preserve.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, we support the passage of the legislation today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRENSHAW), who is the sponsor of this important legislation.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3768. I introduced this bill to provide protection to a parcel of land that is located in a historic area of my district, an area called American Beach which has great national significance. This beautiful stretch of shoreline provides a great history and a great story.

Founded in the 1930s by A. L. Lewis, American Beach provided a sunny paradise for African Americans during a tumultuous time in American history. This area of Florida's northeastern shore attracted African Americans from all over the country, including heavyweight boxing champion Joe Lewis, entertainer Cab Calloway, and civil rights leader A. Philip Randolph. While this Nation was struggling to find equality within its shores, American Beach provided a relaxing, culturally unique spot for African Americans to gather along the ocean's edge. The significance of this site was recently recognized when the beach and 120 residential homes in the area were added to the National Registry of Historic Places. Additionally, in 1992 the Florida legislature named American Beach the first site on the Florida Black Heritage Trail.

In his recently released budget, President Bush provides resources for a new Preserve America program through the National Park Service. This initiative is designed to encourage heritage tourism throughout the coun-

try. Today this legislation answers the President's call without spending a single dime of taxpayers' money.

Last year, American Beach's neighbor, Amelia Island Plantation, made arrangements to donate 8.5 acres to the National Park Service. Unfortunately, the Park Service could not accept this generous gift because the acreage rests outside the boundaries of the Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve. And so what this legislation simply does, it allows the National Park Service to accept the historic site by simply modifying the boundaries of the preserve.

I support this addition to the Timucuan, and others like it, where willing property owners and the National Park Service can work together as stewards of our national treasures. I urge the adoption of this bill.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3768, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1415

NATIONAL WAR PERMANENT TRIBUTE HISTORICAL DATABASE ACT

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2201) to authorize the establishment of a national database for purposes of identifying, locating, and cataloging the many memorials and permanent tributes to America's veterans.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2201

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National War Permanent Tribute Historical Database Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) on November 13, 2000, Congress agreed to a resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for cataloging and maintaining public memorials;

(2) there are many thousands of public memorials and permanent tributes throughout the United States and abroad that commemorate military conflicts of the United States and the service of individuals in the Armed Forces;

(3) many of these memorials suffer from neglect and disrepair, and many have been relocated or stored in facilities where the memorials are unavailable to the public and subject to further neglect and damage; and

(4) there exists a need to collect and centralize information regarding the identifica-

tion, location, and description of these memorials, as no such catalog is available to the public from either the Federal Government or any nongovernmental entity.

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF DATABASE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—In order to locate, identify, and catalog the many thousands of permanent tributes that commemorate the military conflicts of the United States, and the service and sacrifice of individuals in the Armed Forces of the United States, and to make such information readily available for the educational benefit of the public, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, may establish and maintain a database known as the National War Permanent Tribute Historical Database.

(b) CONTENT.—The database shall contain information on—

(1) the location, history, and background of the permanent tributes;

(2) photographs and other information to enhance the understanding of the permanent tributes;

(3) information about the veterans in whose honor the permanent tributes are dedicated; and

(4) any other information the Secretary considers appropriate and necessary.

(c) PUBLIC ACCESS.—The database shall be made accessible to the public, through the Internet or by other means, in a format that permits the public to submit information on permanent tributes for the purpose of updating and expanding the database.

(d) ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary of the Interior may seek the assistance of other Federal agencies and the States and their political subdivisions, tribal governments, public or private educational institutions, non-profit organizations, and individuals or other entities that the Secretary considers appropriate in carrying out this Act, and may enter into contracts and cooperative agreements to obtain information or services that assist in the development and implementation of the database.

(e) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term "permanent tribute" means any statue, structure, or other monument on public property commemorating the service of any person or persons in the Armed Forces.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Within 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall transmit to the Congress a report assessing the efficacy and desirability of establishing a permanent fund within the Treasury for the repair, restoration, and maintenance of the memorials identified and catalogued under section 3. The report shall include recommended criteria regarding appropriate recipients of expenditures from such a fund as well as proposed funding mechanisms and any other information considered by the Secretary to be relevant.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2201.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2201, introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), would authorize the establishment of a national database for purposes of identifying, locating and cataloging the many public memorials and permanent tributes to America's veterans of armed service. Once completed, this database will provide our Nation with an excellent educational resource for future generations to learn about the contributions made by members of our Armed Forces. It will also serve as yet another reminder of the sacrifice so many Americans have given to defend our country and the freedoms that we hold so dear.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2201 is supported by the majority and minority of the committee, and I urge adoption of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2201 is a bipartisan measure introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), that will help further the commemoration of the service rendered in military conflicts throughout American history.

There are thousands of public memorials that commemorate military conflicts of the United States and the service of individuals of the U.S. Armed Forces. On November 13, 2000, Congress agreed to a resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for cataloging and maintaining public memorials.

As I said, there are many thousands of public memorials and permanent tributes throughout the United States, including in my district, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and abroad, that commemorate military conflicts of the United States and the service of individuals in the Armed Forces. Many of these memorials suffer from neglect and disrepair and many have been relocated or stored in facilities where the memorials are unavailable to the public and subject to further neglect and damage.

There also exists a need to collect and centralize information regarding the identification, location and description of these memorials, as no such catalog is available to the public from either the Federal Government or any nongovernmental agency.

By directing the establishment of a centralized database of these public memorials, H.R. 2201 will contribute to the increased recognition and understanding of the events and people involved in the defense of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) for his initiative on this important matter. I wholeheartedly support this bipartisan measure and urge its adoption by the House today.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2201.

I want to thank Chairman POMBO and Ranking Member RAHALL as well as Subcommittee Chairman RADANOVICH and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, Dr. CHRISTENSEN for their leadership in having the Resources Committee act so promptly on this bill. And I greatly appreciate the cooperation from the Veterans' Affairs Committee that has made it possible for the bill to come to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to help the government and the public to keep track of the many important war memorials on public lands throughout our country.

It would also provide for a report to Congress to determine if there should be a permanent fund within the Treasury for the upkeep of these memorials.

These memorials remind us that the freedom we enjoy in the United States has not just been given to us—Americans have made great sacrifices, including their lives, to protect our way of life.

Unfortunately many of these memorials don't receive the care they deserve and have fallen into disrepair.

These memorials may not be as large as those on the National Mall or Arlington Nation Cemetery but they are just as important and should be taken care of.

In 2002, Congress agreed to a resolution expressing the need for cataloging and maintaining public memorials. The bill would follow through by taking the first step of cataloging our public war memorials.

By cataloging and reporting to Congress on the condition of all war memorials on public lands and by considering how to maintain them we make sure that our veterans are not forgotten.

Passage of this bill will be a step toward renewing our commitment to honor our Nation's veterans. I urge approval of the bill.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. RADANOVICH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2201.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPLAUDING THE MEN AND WOMEN WHO KEEP AMERICA MOVING AND RECOGNIZING NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 420) applauding the men and women who keep America moving and recognizing National Transportation Week.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 420

Whereas the United States transportation system is an extensive, inter-related public and private network of roads, airports, railroads, transit routes, waterways, terminals, ports, and pipelines;

Whereas millions of people and businesses rely on this expanding system to get to work, embark on vacations, conduct business, and ship goods within the United States and abroad;

Whereas this system links regions and connects small and large cities and urban and rural areas;

Whereas transportation contributes to economic activity and to a nation's global competitiveness as a service, an industry, and an infrastructure;

Whereas the transportation sector accounts for 11 percent of the United States Gross Domestic Product;

Whereas the transportation sector employs over 11 million Americans;

Whereas the average household spends about 20 percent of its income on transportation, more than on any other expense except housing;

Whereas the President has proclaimed, by Executive Order, May 16 through May 22, 2004, as National Transportation Week;

Whereas Congress, by joint resolution approved May 16, 1957 (36 U.S.C. 120), designated the third Friday in May of each year as "National Defense Transportation Day" and, by joint resolution approved May 14, 1962 (36 U.S.C. 133), declared that the week during which that Friday falls be designated as "National Transportation Week"; and

Whereas National Transportation Week provides an opportunity for the transportation community to join together for greater awareness about the importance of transportation and for making youth aware of transportation-related careers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the 108th Congress—

(1) applauds the men and women who keep America moving;

(2) recognizes National Transportation Week by supporting the goals of that Week; and

(3) urges all Americans to become more aware of the benefits and contributions of transportation to the United States economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) and the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 420, introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), recognizes the week of May 16 through the 22 as National Transportation Week and applauds the men and women who keep America moving.

Every Member of this body is well aware of the importance and the significance of our Nation's transportation system and its direct impact on the lives of everyone. According to the Bureau of Transportation Statistics,

the U.S. transportation system is composed of 46,747 miles of interstate highways, nearly 600 million airline passengers, 97,631 miles of class-one freight railroads, over 160,000 route-miles by bus, 26,000 miles of navigable waterways and over 69,000 miles of oil pipelines.

Mr. Speaker, our transportation system is so important to our Nation's economic activity and to our Nation's global competitiveness as a service, an industry and an infrastructure that it is more than appropriate that we recognize and applaud the men and women who keep America moving.

Our transportation sector accounts for 11 percent of the United States' gross domestic product and employs over 11 million Americans.

In my home State of Nevada, we are absolutely dependent on transportation for our economy. Tourism is the number one employer in my district, and the number one, two or three employer in every district in the country. Without the 30 million people who travel through McCarran International Airport each year, or the millions more who drive to Las Vegas and Laughlin down I-15 and US-95, we would not be experiencing the unprecedented growth in our community that we currently enjoy today.

I could go on, but I will conclude by saying I am encouraged every day by the new technologies that are constantly being developed to move us in ways that are faster, more efficient and environmentally sensitive. In Las Vegas, we are seeking to become the first community to deploy high-speed Maglev rail technology to better link us to southern California. We are also deploying Intelligent Transportation System technology known as the FAST system to warn us of traffic delays and Amber alerts.

Again, it is important that we recognize the significance and enormous contributions that transportation makes to our Nation's economy. I urge the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 420, a resolution recognizing National Transportation Week and applauding the men and women who keep America moving.

Although Congress established National Transportation Week more than 40 years ago, this concurrent resolution provides an opportunity to acknowledge the great contribution of advances in transportation to our Nation's economic success and to salute the men and women who toil on a daily basis to improve America's mobility.

Our transportation investments have paid enormous dividends and enabled

our Nation to become the premier economic power in the world. For instance, over the last 2 decades, spending for transportation and logistics fell from 16 percent of gross domestic product to less than 9 percent. We are moving more goods and more people far more efficiently than ever before. By reducing the portion of GDP that is dedicated to logistics, this 7 percent efficiency gain in our \$10 trillion economy results in a savings of more than \$700 billion per year.

It is this great American success story that this resolution recognizing National Transportation Week celebrates, and I urge Members to support the resolution.

But words without deeds are meaningless. The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on a bipartisan basis recognized that the beginning. Under the leadership of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), they worked together to craft a bill that would invest \$375 billion over 6 years to improve our highways, transit systems and safety programs, the very level of investment derived from the Department of Transportation's report on our highway and transit needs. Moreover, the investment would create and sustain up to 3.6 million family wage construction jobs, including 1.7 million new jobs.

Despite strong bipartisan support for this legislation in the House, the House Republican leadership, at the bidding of the White House, would not allow the committee to bring that bipartisan bill to the floor. Had the Bush administration not erected the roadblocks that prevented our bill from advancing through the legislative process, we could have celebrated National Transportation Week in a more meaningful way, pouring the concrete, laying the rail, and cutting the paychecks envisioned within the enactment of TEA-LU.

In an effort to move the bill forward, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reluctantly reported and the House overwhelmingly passed a bill weeks ago with an investment level that is more than \$100 billion less than our original bill, \$100 billion less than what DOT's analysis shows is required to relieve congestion and improve the surface transportation system in our country.

But even the significantly smaller House bill, authorizing \$283 billion and guaranteeing \$275 billion is too high for the White House. The administration is still insisting that the total investment be no more than \$256 billion over 6 years.

So, let me be clear on what the administration's bill provides: Not one more dollar for highway and transit infrastructure, not one new job. Compared to where we are today, the administration's bill provides no increase for highway funding and no increase for transit funding for the next 5 years, not a single additional dollar. As a re-

sult, not one additional job will be created by this zero-growth investment.

The administration's absolute insistence on flat-line investment for highway and transit infrastructure is unprecedented. In contrast, under TEA21, highway investment jumped from \$21.5 billion in fiscal year 1998 to \$31.6 billion in fiscal year 2003, a 47 percent increase. Transit investment grew even faster, from \$4.6 billion in 1998 to \$7.3 billion in fiscal year 2003, a 56 percent increase. Even under very difficult budget conditions in the early 1990s, under ISTEA, highway investment still managed to increase from \$16.8 billion in 1992 to \$18.3 billion in 1997, a 9 percent increase.

Under the President's bill, highway investment will have zero percent growth, from \$33.6 billion in 2004 to \$33.6 billion in 2009. Similarly, transit investment will have zero percent growth, from \$7.2 billion in 2004 to \$7.2 billion in fiscal year 2009. Moreover, the President's proposal will cut the guaranteed transit investment to \$5.9 billion, an 18 percent cut from fiscal year 2003.

Mr. Speaker, this country has worked too hard to put the current transportation system in place to allow the administration and this Congress to squander previous investments made over generations and allow that system to deteriorate. As we celebrate National Transportation Week, let us move beyond the rhetoric of congressional resolutions to a bill that honors the work of generations of transportation workers and a system that must remain the envy of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 420.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity, while discussing National Transportation Week, to personally thank the 11 million Americans in our Nation's transportation workforce, especially those in Texas and the Dallas-Fort Worth area, for their hard work. They literally keep America moving, and I am pleased that we can recognize them all today.

Mr. Speaker, moving people and goods quickly and efficiently is vital to keeping the United States globally competitive, and we need to break the impasse and complete a right-sized highways and transit bill. The needs are many, and many Americans need the work.

Not only must we adequately invest in our transportation systems, but we must also continue to invest in transportation workforce development. Today's youth in America will be constructing and operating our future transportation systems, and we must encourage imagination, innovation and interest in transportation.

Mr. Speaker, National Transportation Week could not have come at a better time. I urge the administration to allow us to proceed with a highways and transit bill that will create good jobs for Americans and provide resources to deal with the bottlenecks, crumbling bridges, the need for more light rail construction, intermodal terminals, trade corridors, transportation security, and safety programs.

□ 1430

I would like to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), for being some of our Nation's biggest advocates for safe and efficient transportation systems. I look forward to continuing to work with them to address our Nation's infrastructure needs. I thank the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) for leading this discussion.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, a little more indepth history of the southern Nevada challenge in transportation, I think, today with Transportation Week it would be appropriated.

As you know, Nevada is one of the fastest growing States in the Union. We are growing at 5 to 7,000 people a month into the southern Nevada area. You can imagine the challenges that we have before us as a community that has almost doubled in the last 10 years, literally creating communities the size of 60 or 70,000 people every year.

Fortunately, over a decade ago, members of the Clark County Commission, local governments across the valley, decided to get together and create what is called the Regional Transportation Commission. The Regional Transportation Commission in concert with five local communities in southern Nevada worked together for the betterment and improvement of the southern Nevada area. As I mentioned, with the massive growth, the transportation needs are extreme. Fortunately, with the passage of this bill we will see additional funds to help us with this growth. And I applaud leadership and I applaud the chairman and the ranking member for their leadership.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to voice my support for H. Con. Res. 420, a bill that designates May 16–22, 2004 as National Transportation Week. Sponsored by the U.S. Department of Transportation, and more than 30 other transportation industry organizations, National Transportation Week is an opportunity to highlight the functions and accomplishments of the transportation industry.

There are nearly 4 million miles of roads in the United States. That's enough to circle the globe 16 times, travel round trip to the moon 8 times, or take 800 round trips between New York and Los Angeles. Since 1982 our population has grown almost 19 percent, the number of registered motor vehicles has increased 36 percent, and vehicle miles traveled has

ballooned 72 percent. In spite of this growth, we have failed to keep pace with the increasing demands on highways and transit systems. Over the last 20 years we have added less than five percent to road capacity and even less to public transit.

Transportation is about people, and about providing them with the opportunity to lead safer, healthier, and more fulfilling lives. Moreover, our country's economic strength, our ability to improve productivity, and our capacity to create jobs are all dependent—to a great extent—on the health and vitality of our transportation system and its infrastructure. In 2003 the value of imported goods and goods designated for export that were carried on our Nation's transportation system amounted to nearly \$2 trillion—that's \$1,259 billion in imports and \$724 billion in exports.

According to the Census Bureau and the U.S. Department of Transportation forecasts, by the year 2020: Annual vehicle miles traveled in the U.S. will increase 51 percent—from 2.8 trillion in 2000 to 4.2 trillion in 2020; the driving age population in the United States will increase 21 percent by 2020; and truck freight volumes will nearly double from 9 billion tons in 2000, to almost 17 billion tons in 2020.

I am stating these statistics because I am very concerned about the inadequate funding of our Nation's transportation system and this Committee's transportation bill. Without increased investment we will suffer both socially and economically. For every \$1 billion invested in Federal highway and transit spending, 47,500 jobs are created or sustained. Our Nation's deteriorating infrastructure and congestion, along with safety and economic problems warrant our strong and immediate response. Hopefully, during National Transportation Week, by acknowledging how heavily we rely on our national transportation system and the essential role it plays in our social and economic health, we will agree on a funding figure that adequately supports our need to keep America moving.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 420.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE DEDICATION OF THE NATIONAL WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 423) authorizing the use of the Capitol

Grounds for activities associated with the dedication of the National World War II Memorial.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 423

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL DEDICATION.

The Capitol Grounds may be used for a public event providing additional space in conjunction with the dedication of the National World War II Memorial on May 29, 2004, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate.

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

The event to be carried out under this resolution shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board.

SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to erect on Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event to be carried out under this resolution.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements that may be required to carry out the event under this resolution.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 4 of the Act of July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 5104(c); 60 Stat. 718), concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event to be carried out under this resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER).

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 423, introduced by the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), permits the use of the Capitol grounds for an overflow audience from the National World War II Memorial dedication ceremony.

This ceremony, which will occur at the National World War II Memorial, dedicates the memorial in honor of hundreds of thousands of men and women that gave their lives in the cause of freedom from 1941 through 1945.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written about the Greatest Generation, about the economy and country they built when they returned from the war. We are honored to have a number of those veterans serving in this body, and I am certainly personally grateful to have been able to work with each and every one of them. It is important that we as Congress do all we can to facilitate this very important ceremony,

and this concurrent resolution will allow more veterans to participate, albeit from a distance.

In my home State of Nevada, we have one of the fastest-growing veteran populations in the Nation with an increase in 30 percent with the veteran population in the 1990s. More than 18 percent of the approximately 240,000 veterans living in Nevada served during World War II, and I am honored to support this resolution on their behalf.

I support this resolution and encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER). I rise in support of this resolution to authorize the use of the Capitol grounds for activities associated with the dedication of the World War II Memorial. The main dedication event is scheduled for Saturday, May 29, during the Memorial Day holiday weekend.

The resolution authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for public events in conjunction with the dedication. In 1993, President Clinton signed PL 103-32 to authorize the construction of a memorial in Washington, D.C., to all the members of the armed services who served in World War II. In 1995, President Clinton dedicated the site on the Mall and the proposed design was unveiled at the White House in 1997.

The gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is a leading advocate for the memorial and has been its staunch champion and sponsored this resolution.

Consistent with any event on the Capitol grounds, this event shall be free of charge and open to the public. To accommodate overflow visitors and participants, the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to set up a stage and any sound equipment that may be required for the event. Further, the Capitol Hill Police shall enforce the traditional restrictions on advertising on the Capitol grounds.

The dedication is an event long anticipated by World War II veterans and their families. I support the resolution and urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to recognize my father who served in World War II, what a great tribute to him and his friends and all those other folks that served our country and paid the ultimate sacrifice, and to my uncle who was in Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR).

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms.

EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for yielding me this time, and I thank our dear colleague from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) for allowing us this time on the floor. Also, to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), I would like to thank him personally and to his able assistant, Ted Van Der Meid, for helping us move this legislation. I also want to thank the gentleman from the great State of Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for making this moment a reality.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to bring to the floor H. Con. Res. 423, which authorizes the use of these Capitol grounds for activities associated with the dedication of the World War II Memorial on May 29, Memorial Day weekend, just a week from this Saturday.

Mr. Speaker, the dedication ceremony for the World War II Memorial will mark the beginning of the end of a 20-year journey. It will mark the recognition by this Nation that a grateful Nation does remember the most unselfish generation America has ever known. And when that memorial is dedicated between the Washington Monument, which marks the founding of our Republic in the 18th century, and the Lincoln Memorial, which acknowledges the preservation of this Union during the 19th century, this memorial will represent the fulcrum of the 20th century, that is the victory of liberty over tyranny in a just war.

The ceremony that will occur, including here on the Capitol grounds, will mark the culmination of a process that took form here in the people's House some 17 years ago when the original authorizing legislation that the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) referred to was first introduced by me. Many, many Members were a part of making this possible. It has taken 10 Congresses and three Presidents. And I want to place in the RECORD, if I might, the wonderful Members of this House who made this ceremony and this Memorial Day possible:

Congressman Sonny Montgomery, Mississippi, now retired; Congressman Bob Stump, Arizona, now passed; the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS), currently the ranking member on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs; Congressman Henry Gonzalez of Texas, now passed; Congressman Bill Clay of Missouri, retired; Congressman Esteban Torres of California, now retired; Congressman John Grotberg, the Speaker's predecessor of the great State of Illinois, now passed; and from the other body, in particular, Senator John Glenn, retired; and Senator Strom Thurmond, now passed.

I think people tend to forget that the World War II Memorial which opened to the public approximately 3 weeks ago to rave reviews was a House idea, a House initiative, a House effort that the House kept alive for 2 decades.

On Thursday we will have a ceremony here in Statuary Hall to honor the six World War II veterans who cur-

rently serve in our people's House. We will present at that time to them the two flags that were handmade in the Buckeye State, in the State of Ohio, as we give them over to the Nation. And I would like to say a special thank you to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

The legislative history behind the World War II Memorial is replete with struggle and controversy and occasional disappointment, but in the end a great victory and a magnificent tribute. There were stops and starts along the way, and no one knows this better than I; but in the end nothing could stop this powerful idea that came from the Heartland of America, from the Buckeye State, from the heart of one veteran named Roger Durbin from Berkey, Ohio, population 265, Lucas County; It is an idea that came from the grassroots of America. It was so meritorious that it eventually arrived here in our Nation's Capital and now has full expression on our Mall of democracy.

As we prepare to formally dedicate the memorial on May 29, this resolution will facilitate the use of the Capitol grounds and facilities to honor the hundreds of thousands of World War II-generation members and their families and their children and their grandchildren, as we dedicate that sacred soil on the Mall between the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument.

In our district, as in other districts around the country, plans are already under way by many veterans organizations including the American Legion for local celebrations to coincide with the May 29 dedication here in our Nation's Capital. There will be satellite uplinks from all of the celebrations here. In our home town of Toledo, Ohio, local organizers will hold a ceremony in Fifth Third Field, the city that is home to the Toledo Mud Hens baseball team. Plans are already underway. Our community will hold the largest parade our citizenry has ever seen.

In Vermilion, Ohio, the local funeral director, Judy Riddle, has helped organize an event for the World War II veterans in that community. And it is an understatement to say that the funeral directors in Ohio raised more money than any other State to help build this memorial. In Wellington, Ohio, a local school teacher, Calvin Woods, has organized a group of students and parents to visit the memorial next week. They will be honoring local World War II veterans on the 29th as well.

I can say this, that when Roger Durbin first walked up to me 17 years ago—God rest his soul, he passed in the year of 2000—this was his last dying wish that this memorial be completed. He did not ask for himself. His statement was, Congresswoman KAPTUR,

why is there no World War II Memorial in Washington, D.C. where I can bring my grandchildren so they can understand the causes to which my life was dedicated?

So his desire was that our grandchildren, his grandchildren, America's grandchildren understand. It was rather coincidental, and some would say divine providence, that on the day that the plaza opened to the general public a few weeks ago, the very first group through that site was from Jones Junior High School from the county of Lucas, his home county; and that was not planned.

In fact, when Tim Russert was down there from NBC News, the children were all excited that they could see such a famous reporter. It was totally unplanned. I know Roger Durbin's hand was in that because he intended to be there for that dedication, and he always was dedicated to the future generations.

Thousands of veterans and their families are making their way already to Washington, D.C. to attend this ceremony here on our Nation's Mall. The logistical challenge is daunting. And of the hundreds of thousands of people on the National Mall, over half of them will be World War II veterans and their spouses, and almost all of them will be over 80 years of age.

We are planning a variety of events here in our congressional offices for that weekend. And we are very grateful that the Speaker has permitted the Capitol and its grounds to be open. Along with most Members' offices, our office in Washington will be open to our constituents.

□ 1445

We are also working with the office of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STRICKLAND) to host Ohio's veterans at the American Legion Post 8 here on Capitol Hill, both on Saturday evening and Sunday morning. We are expecting several busloads of veterans just from northwest Ohio, and those are the ones that we actually know about. We know some of them, well, they are just going to drive with their grandkids in campers and show up, and we are ready for them.

This concurrent resolution is essentially a formality. But it is the precursor to Congress rolling out the red carpet for the greatest generation America has ever known—our World War II veterans and their families, and other members of the World War II generation who served on the home front, their friends and family members, and other Americans who will be in town for the Memorial Day weekend. It is going to be a very heart-rending weekend. We are looking forward to it with great anticipation.

If my colleagues have been down to the site already, they cannot come away with a dry eye. As veterans and their families, some in wheelchairs, some walking with canes, some just there to reflect, come and touch the

marble stone where perhaps where they fought is engraved. I watched one man go up, just touch the words Okinawa and he just stood there. I met a Purple Heart standing there on the plaza, and he thanked me. I said, sir, I was not even born. This is for you, thank you, because America does remember.

I again want to deeply thank the office of the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT); the minority leader's office, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI); and both sides of the aisle of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for their help with this concurrent resolution; and I urge its adoption.

God bless our veterans and God bless America. I thank the gentlewoman for the time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 423 authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for activities associated with the dedication of the World War II Memorial on the National Mall. I'm proud to support this resolution and to support the dedication of the memorial to honor the achievements and sacrifices of our "Greatest Generation."

In 1993, P.L. 103-32 authorized the construction of a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia to honor members of the armed services who served in World War II and to commemorate United States participation in that conflict. Further, the public law authorized the American Battle Monuments Commission to solicit and accept private contributions for the memorial. The formal dedication event for the memorial is scheduled for Saturday, May 29, 2004.

The Capitol Grounds will provide additional space for this event, and the Architect of the Capitol is authorized to set up on the Grounds sound devices, related structures, and equipment as may be required to bring the event to a larger audience. Consistent with all events on Capitol Ground, the Capitol Police will enforce the ban on sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations.

The dedication will be open to the public and free of charge and is expected to draw many hundreds of thousands of visitors and participants to the Capitol. Use of the Capitol Grounds will enable our veterans and the general public to participate more fully in the day's activities and enjoy this much-deserved dedication.

I support the resolution and urge its adoption.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 423.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 420 and H. Con. Res. 423.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

EXPANSION OF DESIGNATED RENEWAL COMMUNITY AREA BASED ON 2000 CENSUS DATA

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4193) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for the expansion of areas designated as renewal communities based on 2000 census data and to treat certain census tracts with low populations as low-income communities for purposes of the new markets tax credit.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4193

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXPANSION OF DESIGNATED RENEWAL COMMUNITY AREA BASED ON 2000 CENSUS DATA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1400E of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to designation of renewal communities) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(g) EXPANSION OF DESIGNATED AREA BASED ON 2000 CENSUS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—At the request of all governments which nominated an area as a renewal community, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may expand the area of such community to include any census tract if—

“(A)(i) at the time such community was nominated, such community would have met the requirements of this section using 1990 census data even if such tract had been included in such community, and

“(ii) such tract has a poverty rate using 2000 census data which exceeds the poverty rate for such tract using 1990 census data, or

“(B)(i) such community would be described in subparagraph (A)(i) but for the failure to meet one or more of the requirements of paragraphs (2)(C)(i), (3)(C), and (3)(D) of subsection (c) using 1990 census data,

“(ii) such community, including such tract, has a population of not more than 200,000 using either 1990 census data or 2000 census data,

“(iii) such tract meets the requirement of subsection (c)(3)(C) using 2000 census data, and

“(iv) such tract meets the requirement of subparagraph (A)(ii).

“(2) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN CENSUS TRACTS WITH LOW POPULATION IN 1990.—In the case of any census tract which did not have a poverty rate determined by the Bureau of the Census using 1990 census data, paragraph

(1)(B) shall be applied without regard to clause (iv) thereof.

“(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR CERTAIN CENSUS TRACTS WITH LOW POPULATION IN 2000.—At the request of all governments which nominated an area as a renewal community, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may expand the area of such community to include any census tract if—

“(A) either—

“(i) such tract has no population using 2000 census data, or

“(ii) no poverty rate for such tract is determined by the Bureau of the Census using 2000 census data,

“(B) such tract is one of general distress, and

“(C) such community, including such tract, meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A) and (B) of subsection (c)(2).

“(4) PERIOD IN EFFECT.—Any expansion under this subsection shall take effect as provided in subsection (b).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the amendments made by section 101 of the Community Renewal Tax Relief Act of 2000.

SEC. 2. POPULATION CENSUS TRACTS WITH LOW POPULATIONS TREATED AS LOW-INCOME COMMUNITIES FOR PURPOSES OF NEW MARKETS TAX CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (e) of section 45D of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to low-income community) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) TRACTS WITH LOW POPULATION.—A population census tract with a population of less than 2,000 shall be treated as a low-income community for purposes of this section if such tract—

“(A) is within an empowerment zone, the designation of which is in effect under section 1391, and

“(B) is contiguous to one or more low-income communities (determined without regard to this paragraph).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to investments made after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON).

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to pass H.R. 4193. This measure will allow communities benefiting from economic development tax incentives to use those incentives to the maximum extent they possibly can.

The purpose of H.R. 4193 is to increase the flexibility communities have to use both the Renewal Communities and the New Markets Tax Credit tax incentives.

The Community Renewal Tax Relief Act of 2000 authorized the Department of Housing and Urban Development to select, based on a highly competitive process, 40 distressed areas across the country as renewal communities. So, as renewal communities, these distressed areas are able to use tax incentives to promote economic development.

These incentives include: One, a zero percent rate for capital gains from the sale of qualifying assets; two, a 15 percent wage credit to employers for the first \$10,000 of qualified wages; three, a commercial revitalization deduction; four, an additional \$35,000 in section 179 expensing for qualified property; and last, expansion of the Work Opportunity Tax Credit.

Communities were initially selected based on the 1990 census data for population and poverty rates because this was the most current data available at the time. We now have up-to-date 2000 census data showing how the population has shifted and the population and poverty rates have moved. H.R. 4193 is going to allow a renewal community to include additional census tracts which have experienced rising poverty according to the 2000 and 2002 census.

The bill also updates the New Markets Tax Credit by helping more distressed, low-population communities become eligible for the credit's benefit. Today, the profile of these communities makes it hard for them to meet poverty and income tests. Without this adjustment, low-population and economically distressed areas within an Empowerment Zone's boundaries will not get the help they need to develop further.

The House has already acted by unanimous consent to update Renewal Communities with this new 2000 census data. So the addition of the New Markets Tax Credit provision improves the package and does not affect the Federal budget and has broad bipartisan support.

So I urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from New York. His description of the bill is quite adequate, I think.

H.R. 4193 is basically a bill that was passed about 10 years ago, and the census data used at that point was the 1990 census. We now have the 2000 census, and this is simply making this bill work better. Communities like Yakima, Washington; Hamilton, Ohio; and Mobile, Alabama, will be among the many beneficiaries of this change in the law.

It is not a big law. We did not even bother having a hearing in the Committee on Ways and Means on it. So it must not be too big, and I urge the adoption of the bill.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4193.

Over the past decade, few areas of the country have faced the economic and fiscal challenges that my Western New York district has experienced. When a section of the City of Buffalo received a Renewal Community designation by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, I saw the possibility of an economic revival in my district.

When an area is designated as a Renewal Community, businesses located there become

qualified to receive certain tax incentives such as zero-percent capital gains rate on qualified community assets held for five years; work opportunity credits; commercial revitalization deductions; additional Section 179 expensing and the Renewal Community Employment Credit that credits employers \$1500 for each employee who both lives and works in the renewal area.

Because of these significant financial and tax incentives designed for low-income areas, the City of Buffalo has seen many improvements to the local economy. However, like many of the other Renewal Communities across the country, the standards HUD uses to designate renewal communities need to be modified and improved.

The original bill authorizing Renewal Communities, The Community Tax Reform Act of 2000, directs HUD to use poverty, unemployment and population levels based on 1990 census tract data to determine if a tract qualifies for a renewal community designation. To date, HUD has designated 40 Renewal Communities areas across the country using this outdated standard.

Section 1 of H.R. 4193 makes a simple change to these designation requirements by allowing HUD to enlarge a Renewal Community by adding census tracts using 2000 census tract data.

Given the enormous advantages for cities like Buffalo, it just makes sense for areas that continue to face decline to be eligible to use the most current census data available. This bill will provide for the expansion for Renewal Communities across the country so areas like Buffalo and Jamestown, N.Y. can finally realize economic success.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for bringing H.R. 4193 to the floor, and I urge all my colleagues to support this common sense, bipartisan legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4193, which the House is considering today under suspension of the rules.

I want to take a moment to recognize the work done by my colleague, Representative QUINN, who introduced the original bill, H.R. 840, which serves as a basis for H.R. 4193. I was proud to be an original cosponsor of the earlier bill, which would expand the areas of Renewal Communities based on more recent census information.

The Renewal Communities Initiative combines tax credits and other provisions designed to revive some of the nation's more impoverished distressed areas. These cities can take advantage of federal wage credits, tax deductions, capital gains exclusions, and bond financing to stimulate economic development and job growth. Each incentive is tailored to meet the particular needs of a business and offers a significant inducement for companies to locate and hire additional workers.

We have come close before to enacting this commonsense change, but this time we cannot fail.

This is too great an issue of importance to the country, and in particular, my district in Western New York.

Due to a loss of population in the 1990's, my area would greatly benefit from this change.

Out of five Renewal Communities designated in New York State, three are in my district: Buffalo, Niagara Falls, and Rochester.

According to Fannie Mae, this technical change would allow 14 more census tracts to qualify in Rochester, 16 more tracts in Buffalo-Lackawanna, and seven additional census tracts in Niagara Falls.

Each city in my district needs these incentives to expand jobs and promote business investment in our downtown areas. The statistics from my district paint the bleak picture.

The March 2004 employment figures released by the U.S. Department of Labor in late April revealed that the Buffalo-Niagara Falls market had the highest unemployment rate increase over the past year among all major metropolitan areas with one million or more residents.

According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Buffalo's unemployment rate in March was 7.4 percent, up 1.1 points from 6.3 percent a year ago. The number of unemployed was 42,000 this year. In March, Rochester's unemployment rate was 6.7 percent according, with 700 more area people employed in March than in February. However, that is still 4,400 fewer people than had jobs in March 2003.

Manufacturers have slashed about 4,600 jobs in the last year. The biggest dip was in jobs producing nondurable goods such as film—an 8.7 percent drop. This decrease was mainly a result of Eastman Kodak Co.'s continued downsizing.

The Renewal communities program seeks to entice businesses to develop commercial property and hire local employees. I strongly believe that the federal government can be an important partner in local efforts to spur economic development. The program provides critical tools to help with that partnership.

The expansion of the Renewal Communities program would give these cities the necessary spark to reignite their economic engines. I strongly urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4193.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4193 that we are considering today, while making some simple changes to the tax code, would provide considerable positive impact to our low-income and distressed areas for years to come. I strongly support this measure, which would inject much-needed wealth into low-income and poverty-stricken areas through the creation of jobs and opportunities, where few now exist.

I am grateful to the Majority Leader, to the Ways and Means Committee, to its Chairman (Mr. THOMAS) and to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) for bringing H.R. 4193 to the House floor today. Scheduling conflicts prevented them from bringing it to the floor during the last 3 weeks as was originally planned, so it's important to act today. Avoiding delay is the reason for acting today even though I must be absent, due to my longstanding commitment to deliver the commencement address to the graduating class of Oklahoma State University in Oklahoma City. But I am confident H.R. 4193 will be approved without any need for my presence, and thanks to the help from these other Members.

I want to draw your attention to section 2 of the bill, which provides a much-needed correction to the tax code for dealing with what's called the New Markets Tax Credit. This credit is designed to encourage taxpayers to invest in economically-distressed communities that have been designated as Empowerment Zones. Unfortunately, the tax code as it currently stands actually precludes some of the worst hit areas from taking advantage of the

New Markets Tax Credit, which we have the chance today to begin to rectify.

Empowerment Zones were created to rebuild communities in America's poverty-stricken areas through incentives that would entice businesses back to areas that experience high unemployment and shortages of affordable housing. In the words of HUD Secretary Mel Martinez, "This critical partnership between the public and private sectors will give local businesses in distressed neighborhoods an economic boost to help drive revitalization, provide jobs and ultimately build a foundation for stronger communities." Currently, there are 30 areas designated as Empowerment Zones, whose status provides the community with a framework of tax incentives and bond financing that offers a significant inducement for companies to locate in designated distressed areas and to hire additional workers.

The New Markets Tax Credit permits taxpayers to receive a credit against their Federal income taxes for making qualified investments in designated Empowerment Zones, which totals 39 percent of the cost of the investment over a 7-year period. Unfortunately, the current tax code contains a "Catch-22" regarding Empowerment Zones and the New Markets Tax Credit. The credit is administered according to the poverty level of each census tract in an Empowerment Zone. To be eligible for the credit, a census tract must have a 20 percent or greater poverty level assigned to it by the Census Bureau.

The "Catch-22" is that if a census tract has no assigned poverty level then it is not eligible for the credit. Such a case exists in two census tracts of the Oklahoma City Empowerment Zone because they either have no population or an extremely low population. These are census tracts 1027 and 1031.02, which contain large amounts of space with no residences, even though they are in an urban setting (which is not unusual for a city in America's west).

Although the rest of the Oklahoma City Empowerment Zone is New Markets Tax Credit eligible, the federal statute precludes these two census tracts from eligibility as they must have a 20 percent or greater poverty rate. That is an obvious impossibility when there is no population or such an extremely low population that the Census Bureau will not assign a poverty rate. Yet these two tracts face the same compelling economic needs as the rest of the Zone. These two census tracts are in essence donut holes within the Empowerment Zone. They are surrounded by other census tracts that do qualify for the New Markets Tax Credit. Omitting them from that program makes no sense; it is a bureaucratic accident that would defeat the program's purpose. But like a donut, they have none of the tasty dough that makes a donut appealing.

I have worked with the Department of Treasury to try to overcome this obstacle to New Markets Tax Credit eligibility, but existing Federal statute does not grant the Treasury Department the discretionary authority they need to correct the injustice. Therefore, a legislative fix is required. Section 2 corrects this problem by amending the tax code so that census tracts with a population of less than 2,000 are eligible for the NMTC. The 20 percent poverty criteria requirement is waived if the census tract is located in an Empowerment Zone and is contiguous to at least one other low-income community.

Downtown areas often serve as commercial, industrial, and office centers, which consequently have a limited residential population. Ironically, the lack of housing precludes these areas from tax incentives that would help inject affordable housing and energize their economies with activity for the very people these programs are trying to serve. The Oklahoma City Health Sciences Center area serves as one such example. This medical complex is adjacent to downtown Oklahoma City. It includes the Presbyterian Foundation and Research Park, the University of Oklahoma Health Center, and the Oklahoma Blood Institute among other health care providers. These, along with the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation and the Children's Medical Research Institute, are part of a rapidly-developing area of bio-medical research and treatment facilities that is removing blight and serving a wide ranging constituency. But because the census tract that it is located in, as of the 2000 census, had only 72 residents, it was excluded from this program. The Census Bureau will not publish poverty and income information for a census tract such as this, whose source population is so easily identifiable, thus the Health Sciences Center area has no assigned poverty rate and is not New Markets Tax Credit eligible. Enacting H.R. 4193 will encourage development of much-needed affordable housing in this area, and provide job opportunities that will benefit people of all income and skill levels anchored through the growing bio-medical industry.

Another example of a blighted project that would quickly benefit from passage of H.R. 4193 is the Skirvin Plaza Hotel, located in Oklahoma City's inner city. This beautiful 1910 building, which is an important example of early art deco design has been closed since 1988 and is awaiting a developer. Because its census tract has zero population, the hotel is not New Markets Tax Credit eligible. Although its revitalization would greatly contribute to the quality of life in downtown Oklahoma City through the jobs and economic activity that its reopening would bring. The simple fact that affordable housing does not exist in this census tract denies an estimated \$9 million in equity that could otherwise be raised for restoring and reopening this now empty, abandoned hotel.

I have been advised that Oklahoma City is not alone in this situation. Chicago, Detroit, East St. Louis, and New York are also empowerment zone cities each containing census tracts with no population, for a total of 14 zero population tracts. I have to wonder how many other census tracts in empowerment zones also have extremely low populations. I cannot speak to the specifics of each city's case, but I know that Oklahoma City is not alone in its situation.

Although this legislation has particular importance to Oklahoma City, I believe that many federally-designated Empowerment Zones will benefit from its passage. I strongly encourage all members to vote yes for H.R. 4193.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4193.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 4193, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

UNDOCUMENTED ALIEN EMERGENCY MEDICAL ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 2004

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3722) to amend section 1011 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 to impose conditions on Federal reimbursement of emergency health services furnished to undocumented aliens.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3722

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments of 2004”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The provision of medical care by public or private health care providers to undocumented aliens is appropriate only—

(A) to protect the health and safety of United States citizens;

(B) to save the life of an undocumented alien in a life-threatening medical emergency; and

(C) to stabilize an emergency medical condition so that an undocumented alien can be repatriated for medical treatment in the alien's own country.

(2) Federal reimbursement of emergency hospital services furnished to undocumented aliens should be conditioned upon obtaining sufficient information to promptly remove the aliens.

(3) Employers who employ undocumented aliens without completing employment authorization verification procedures should be held liable for uncompensated emergency services furnished to such aliens.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONS FOR RECEIPT OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR EMERGENCY SERVICES FOR UNDOCUMENTED ALIENS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1011 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (Public Law 108-173) is amended—

(1) in subsection (d)(1), by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(C) APPLICATION OF REQUIREMENT.—Under such process, the Secretary shall not provide payment under subsection (c) to an eligible provider that is a hospital for eligible services for an alien described in subsection (c)(5)(A) unless the requirements of subsection (f) are met by that provider with respect to such alien.”;

(2) in subsection (e)(2), by adding at the end the following new sentence: “Such term also includes, with respect to an undocumented alien described in subsection (c)(5)(A), costs for emergency medical transportation and evacuation incurred by a hospital in transferring and removing the alien to a foreign country for receipt of appropriate health care services.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) REQUIREMENT FOR COLLECTION OF IMMIGRATION-RELATED INFORMATION FOR UNDOCUMENTED ALIENS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—No payment may be made under subsection (c) to a hospital with respect to the provision of eligible services to an undocumented alien described in subsection (c)(5)(A) unless the following requirements are met:

“(A) The hospital has obtained in good faith from the alien (or a legal guardian or other representative on behalf of the alien) the following information in a document that is signed by the alien (or such guardian or representative) under oath or affirmation and that is in a form that includes a notice that fraudulent or false statements constitute a criminal act punishable under Federal law:

“(i) The citizenship of the alien.

“(ii) The immigration status of the alien.

“(iii) The address of the alien in the United States.

“(iv) Such personal or financial data regarding the alien as the hospital routinely requires of non-indigent patients, including information regarding health insurance.

“(v) Information on the identity of any current employer of the alien for whom the alien has executed an Internal Revenue Service Form W-4.

A hospital is not liable for the accuracy of the information provided under this subparagraph so long as it exercises reasonable care and good faith in obtaining the information.

“(B) The hospital obtains one or more identifiers for the alien and records such identifiers in a digital, electronic format specified by the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security. Such format shall be compatible with at least one interoperable database maintained by the Secretary of Homeland Security for the purpose of verifying the identity and immigration status of aliens.

“(C) The hospital transmits to the Secretary of Homeland Security, in a digital, electronic format and manner specified by such Secretary, the information provided under subparagraph (A) and the identifier (or identifiers) obtained under subparagraph (B).

“(2) MAINTENANCE OF HOSPITAL RECORDS.—For a period of at least 5 years, a hospital referred to in paragraph (1) shall maintain the original documents described in paragraph (1)(A) on file and makes such documents available for examination by the Secretary and the Secretary of Homeland Security or their designees.

“(3) PROVISION OF TECHNICAL SUPPORT.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall provide hospitals under this section with software, training, and technical support services, at no cost to the hospital, to assist and enable hospitals to comply with the requirements of paragraph (1).

“(4) PROMPT ACTION BY DHS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall take steps as may be necessary—

“(A) to obtain, process, and promptly review information transmitted under paragraph (1)(C);

“(B) to determine whether an alien for whom such information is transmitted is removable under any provision of Federal immigration law; and

“(C) to initiate removal proceedings under the relevant provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act in the case of any such alien who is identified as being removable.

“(5) REMOVABILITY.—An undocumented alien who obtains eligible services through a hospital and does not provide for payment for such services and who fails to provide accurate information described in paragraph (1)(A) or an identifier (as defined in paragraph (6)) shall be treated as removable on the ground described in section 237(a)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1227(a)(5)).

“(6) DEFINITION OF IDENTIFIER.—In this section, the term ‘identifier’ means a fingerprint or other biometric identifier as the Secretary of Homeland Security may require.

“(g) RESPONSIBILITY OF CERTAIN EMPLOYERS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an employer of an undocumented alien worker described in paragraph (2) for whom payments are made to a hospital for eligible services under this section, subject to paragraph (3), the employer shall be liable to the Secretary for the amount of the payments so made.

“(2) UNDOCUMENTED ALIEN WORKER DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘undocumented alien worker’ means, with respect to an employer, an undocumented alien described in subsection (c)(5)(A)—

“(i) who is an unauthorized alien (as defined in section 274A(h)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(h)(3)));

“(ii) who has provided the employer with an Internal Revenue Service Form W-4; and

“(iii) with respect to whom neither the conditions described in subparagraph (B)(i) or the condition described in subparagraph (B)(ii) have been met.

“(B) CONDITIONS FOR EXEMPTION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iii)—

“(i) FIRST SET OF CONDITIONS.—The conditions described in this clause for an employer and alien are the following:

“(I) The employer and alien have fully complied with all requirements of the employment verification system prescribed in section 274A(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1324a(b)).

“(II) The employer has enrolled the alien in a State workmen's compensation plan.

“(III) The alien is enrolled under a health benefits plan or health insurance coverage that provides such level of coverage with respect to emergency medical and hospitalization benefits as the Secretary shall specify, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(IV) The employer has assumed responsibility for any cost-sharing (including applicable deductibles and coinsurance) that applies to the alien.

“(ii) ALTERNATIVE CONDITION.—The condition described in this clause for an employer and alien are that the employer has verified the employment authorization of the alien through the voluntary basic employment verification pilot program under section 403(a) of the Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104-208), where available, or by any other means made available for such verification purposes by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(3) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—The liability of an employer under this subsection shall be limited to an employer that employs an undocumented alien worker at the time (as specified under rules of the Secretary of Homeland Security) the eligible services are provided for which payment may be made by the Secretary under this section.

“(h) LIMITATION ON CARE REQUIRED.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including section 1867 of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1395dd), a hospital is not required to make available to an undocumented alien described in subsection (c)(5)(A) care or services if—

“(1) the alien may be transported to the alien’s country of origin (as determined in accordance with rules of the Secretary of Homeland Security) without a significant likelihood of material deterioration of medical condition of the alien (or, in the case of an alien in active labor, of the child), within reasonable medical probability, resulting from the transfer of the alien from the hospital; or

“(2) the care—

“(A) involves organ transplantation or other extraordinary medical treatment (or other treatment the estimated cost of which exceeds \$50,000); and

“(B) is for treatment of a condition that existed before the alien entered the United States or is not required as a direct and immediate result of an accident in the United States.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall be effective as if included in the enactment of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003.

(c) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall issue interim regulations implementing the amendments made by subsection (a) no later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act and shall permit a period of public notice and comment of at least 90 days.

(2) FINAL REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall issue final regulations implementing such amendments not later than one year after the date of publication of such interim regulations.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall submit to the chairman and ranking minority member of the Judiciary and Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Select Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs an annual report on the implementation of section 1011 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003, as amended by this section.

(2) ITEMS TO BE INCLUDED.—Each annual report under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a cost analysis of Federal expenditures under such section 1011;

(B) a description of the assistance provided to hospitals under subsection (f)(2) of such section;

(C) the number of undocumented aliens removed under subsection (f)(3) of such section; and

(D) amounts recovered from employers under subsection (g) of such section.

(e) FEASIBILITY OF EFFECTING TREATIES FOR INTERNATIONAL MEDICAL EVACUATION.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary of State shall conduct an analysis of the feasibility and appropriateness of the following:

(A) Negotiating with foreign states treaties under which such states provide payment for the cost of international medical evacuation for their nationals who require emergency health care in the United States and who do not otherwise have insurance or other coverage for the costs of such care.

(B) In the case of nationals of a foreign state for whom significant costs are incurred under section 1011 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 and for which state a treaty described in subparagraph (A) is not in effect, imposing a visa, port of entry, or similar surcharge the proceeds of which may be used towards such costs and towards the cost of international medical evacuation described in such clause.

(2) REPORT.—The Secretary of State shall submit to the committees described in subsection (d)(1) a report on the analysis under paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3722.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), the author of the pending legislation, be allowed to control debate on this bill on the majority side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, Congress has the opportunity to reassure the American people that there are elected representatives on their sides. No vote could be more indicative as to the priorities of a Member of Congress.

Is America to have a policy of unrestricted health care for illegal immigrants at the expense of American citizens and legal residents? That is the issue we are discussing today. Voting for H.R. 3722 means that my colleagues are not in favor of spending our limited health care dollars in an unrestricted way to give illegal aliens all the health care that they need in terms of today’s standards.

Those Members of Congress voting against H.R. 3722 are draining limited health care dollars that should be going to our own citizens and legal residents.

H.R. 3722 would put some common-sense controls over the \$1 billion fund that was created by a rider that was added onto the Medicare bill that passed just a few months ago.

What does H.R. 3722 do? One thing it does not do is add a burden of paperwork to the hospital emergency rooms, and that is a bogus argument. I would warn my fellow constituents that that lie has been spread around this body in

order to get people to vote in the wrong way. It is a bogus argument.

To be reimbursed, the hospitals will be asking questions. To get part of that \$1 billion fund they will be asking questions anyway. This legislation does not add considerably to any major degree to those questions. It simply adds a following question: Who was the immigrant’s last employer or his current employer? Plus, the hospital must then take a photo or a fingerprint, which may be required to get that fund money in the first place. This information would then be available to the Department of Homeland Security and the INS.

This legislation does not require any reporting by the hospitals or the doctors or anyone else to the Department of Homeland Security. That, too, is a bogus argument that is going around, only we will hear it in the debate, I am sure. The hospitals do no investigating, no reporting; they simply have the information that is given to them when the patient is put into the system and that is made available to government agencies. It is the government agencies, the Department of Homeland Security and INS, that do the investigating, that do the rest of the work. Do not fall for bogus arguments.

Our hospitals today feel compelled to provide extensive and even long-term treatment to illegal aliens. That is what our bill, H.R. 3722, does second. It makes sure that our hospitals are relieved of this enormous burden of trying to provide unlimited health care to any illegal that comes into an emergency room.

We have been giving heart bypasses, even transplants. A young girl from Mexico had \$5 million worth of expenditures in heart transplants just a few months ago, and then when the transplant did not work, her family, who were here illegally and actually had emigrated here with a \$5,000 fee to a coyote, then sued the hospital because the transplant did not work. Well, this cost us billions of dollars a year.

If someone has a genetic disease or something like that, our emergency rooms should not be treating this in the first place; and the fact is, this bill will alleviate that burden by saying that only if a person’s life is imminently threatened by that malady do the hospitals have to focus on that and treat someone whose life is immediately being threatened rather than provide hundreds of thousands of dollars of long-term cancer care, genetic problems, et cetera.

□ 1500

This alone will save billions of dollars that should be going to the American people. The doctor will only determine how much treatment is necessary to get this person to a transportation source that will get them back to their home country so their home country can pay for the health care costs, rather than our senior citizens and our young people being deprived of the resources for their health care.

Number three. If it is a life-threatening emergency, the illegal alien will be treated. There is no doubt about that. This bill does not change that. But if he has no insurance, the alien's employer or former employer will be given the bill. Businessmen will be given the bill if they hire illegal immigrants who end up draining away our health care dollars. This makes all the sense in the world.

Now, the businessmen are coming out against this, saying how can we judge? In 2005, there is a system already being worked on and being established that with one phone call they will be able to determine if they are hiring an illegal immigrant. If a businessman has not made that phone call and has hired someone without checking it out, then he will pay for the health care costs rather than having the taxpayer pay for it.

We will hear a lot of people trying to tell us there are a lot of other things in this bill that are not. But it comes down to this: Whose side are we on? Do we care about our own senior citizens more than we care about strangers from overseas? Do we care more about our own people than we care about strangers from overseas?

If we keep trying to provide everything for everybody, our system is going to break down, and it is doing so right now in California. I would urge my colleagues to support 3722 and prove to their constituents just whose side they are on. We could have corrected this a long time ago, but we hear people all the time, and we will hear it today, with every excuse for not doing something. But the fact is some people in our country are benefiting from illegal immigration. They are very powerful. But it is hurting American citizens, and this bill tries to put a stop to that, or at least turn that situation around today with H.R. 3722.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE).

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time, and I rise in opposition to H.R. 3722.

Mr. Speaker, if enacted, The Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments will turn our hospital caregivers into "de facto" border patrol agents for the Federal government. The measure would require hospitals to take biometric "identifiers"—fingerprints or digital photographs—of any patient whom they suspect of being an illegal immigrant and send that information to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), in order to receive funding for the uncompensated costs of providing emergency care to undocumented immigrants. Hospitals are already understaffed and they do not have the resources needed to collect this information while trying to administer emergency care.

This bill would discourage illegal aliens from seeking treatment for possibly contagious diseases for fear of being deported. In close-knit communities, such as many border areas, dis-

ease can spread quickly. This would lead to a potential health crisis in areas throughout the country—especially the southwest.

Illegal immigrants are in the United States as a direct result of the government's inability to control our borders, and our hospitals are bearing the brunt by not being reimbursed. Controlling immigration is a Federal responsibility—not the responsibility of doctors and nurses trying to administer care. Border Patrol agents are not taking illegal immigrants into custody who need medical treatment to avoid paying for the care. Federal agencies should be responsible for what is a Federal problem.

The Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act (EMTALA) requires hospitals to provide emergency care to anyone who comes to their emergency rooms, without regard to race, creed, color, financial ability to pay, citizenship, or immigration status. H.R. 3722 goes directly against EMTALA by forcing hospitals to guess which patients they believe are illegal immigrants, take down information about their immigration status, employer and address, and report to the Department of Homeland Security. It would burden hospital workers with a staggering amount of administrative work and subject them to charges of discrimination for singling out certain individuals for identification.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services is creating regulations to keep hospitals accountable for how they are reimbursed for treating illegal aliens. Those regulations are due in September. Passing this legislation would directly preclude CMS—the agency that knows best how to handle this situation. If it is deemed these regulations are not adequate, we should revisit this debate.

Do not turn doctors and nurses into police officers. Oppose H.R. 3722.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3722. I think this is one of the most outrageous pieces of legislation I have seen this year, and unfortunately I believe it is a misguided bill. I believe that this bill does not stand for all of those that we represent in our districts.

I understand that through the census count we account for everyone in our districts, and that goes for the gentleman from Orange County, California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), where I know he has an undisclosed number of people who may not be registered or accounted for; but he gets credit for that. Those numbers are put into place because we represent every single person, whether they are accounted for or not legally.

This bill goes in the wrong direction because it asks for our hospitals to become enforcers of immigration law. I cannot underscore how important it is to discuss this matter. Because as it is now, in California, we have already gone through the battle of 187 and trying to keep health care services and English educational services for children. The courts found that unconstitutional. Do we have to go to battle again?

Why does this bill have to direct our resources that right now are so, so important for every single person in our

districts and be used to ask our hospital administrators, doctors, nurses, aides, to now require to have 5 years' worth of records that they must maintain giving some kind of evidence that they serve people who may be undocumented? That, in and of itself, I would say is a waste of time and money, money that should be afforded to sick people.

What happens in a classroom when you have a sick child who may, under no fault of their own, be there and not be a U.S. citizen? When they go to kindergarten, there is nothing that says that the child next to them will not be infected by maybe a contagious disease that they have. Hopefully, that never happens; but the fact that they would be prevented from health care services, and just knowing the fear that that family would have to go through to enter into the doors of a hospital knowing somehow they may not come back; that somehow Homeland Security is going to be there to pick them up and ship them back. And what about a woman going through active labor? She will be deported, because under the gentleman's bill that is what it says. The bill goes in the wrong direction.

I am standing with people in my district. And, in fact, there are several hospitals in the gentleman's own district who are against the bill. Some of the hospitals in Orange County: Garden Grove Hospital Medical Center, Loma Linda University, Queen of Angels Hollywood Presbyterian Hospital, Scripps Mercy Hospital, Suburban Medical Center, Sutter Medical Center in Santa Rosa, and Western Medical Center in Santa Ana.

Throughout the State of California we are finding many of our friends, both in public and private sector hospitals, are against this bill. So I do not think we are standing alone here. I think we are standing very united that we see a very misguided bill, unfortunately, that is being presented to us today.

The Federation of American Hospitals, the American Hospital Association, the Catholic Health Association of the United States, and the National Association of Children's Hospitals are all in agreement that this bill goes in the wrong direction.

I would ask for Members to consider the people who are joining us today that are saying this is the wrong message. We all have an obligation, I believe, to provide under our own laws service to people who come to our hospitals. That is a given. We do that. And maybe it is an unfunded mandate, but it is one we all abide by. I do not think we are in a position to turn people away.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman

from California (Ms. SOLIS) has 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds and just note that this fund of a billion dollars that was created that we now have to put some controls on, and that is what 3722 is trying to do, creates a perverse incentive. If we let this go through as it stands, what is going to happen is this: people who come to the emergency rooms who are American citizens or legal residents who have no insurance will be put behind and at the end of the line and the illegal immigrants will be put to the front of the line because the Federal Government is picking up the tab.

This is a perverse priority. We should be taking care of our own citizens before we take care of illegal aliens.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for bringing H.R. 3722 here before us and before the floor.

We have already a jobs magnet. The jobs magnet that is there is what draws so much illegal immigration into this country. The disincentive has not been put in place. This is not the first administration that has not aggressively enforced our immigration laws. This jobs magnet exists, and we have added to that a new magnet. The new magnet is called free health care for illegals, and then we tap into the American taxpayers.

Now, I hear my Democrat colleagues over on this side continually railing about overspending, overspending. This is overspending. And it is not just a billion dollars. That responsibility comes to \$9 billion a year, and it is growing. So we add to the jobs magnet the free health care magnet.

And by the way, I want to point out that the system the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) addressed, where an employer has an ability now, and will have by December 31 everywhere in the country, to verify the hiring and the legal status of a prospective employee, is called the SAFE Act. It has been in six States now. I have run that system myself. It is Web-based, as well as a phone call, but Web-based, and it is as close to infallible as anything we can put out, and it is going to get better. Employers can guarantee that they are hiring legal employees.

We do not need to be subsidizing the health care for illegals. That is another way of subsidizing employers who are taking advantage of the cheaper labor that sets our hardworking Americans back and puts them in the unemployment lines. This is a national security issue, it is a national budget issue, it is a cultural continuity issue, and it is a commonsense issue.

I thank the gentleman from California for bringing the bill, and I enthusiastically support H.R. 3722.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes and 20 seconds to the distin-

guished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to a fiscally irresponsible, unsafe, and discriminatory bill that is only on the House floor due to a back-room deal that was reached late at night to gain passage of the Republican Medicare prescription drug bill. That deal was reached at the expense of Americans of Hispanic descent and of other immigrant groups that are now legal and also U.S. citizens, as well as our Nation's health is disgraceful. We continue to see elements of the xenophobic face of the Republican Party.

What does this bill do? If you are rolled into an emergency room and you do not have insurance, then you are to be asked whether or not you are here legally in the United States. Now, I get rolled into an emergency room, Mr. MENENDEZ, or maybe someone who might even be described as more characteristically Hispanic, or maybe Asian, or some other group, and I do not happen to have insurance, as unfortunately 40 million Americans who are here as U.S. citizens do not have, and I get asked whether or not I am a citizen of the United States. That is shameful. You would not ask any other citizen that. But because I happen to have the misfortune of not having health insurance, you ask me. And of course those of us who look a certain way will for sure be asked.

And then what else do you do? While I am suffering, not only do you want that information, but then we are going to go through an Orwellian process of getting some type of digital electronic identifier of this U.S. citizen who does not have insurance but cannot prove that he is or is not a U.S. citizen lying there in that emergency room. That is what the bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) does. Do not be deceived.

Now, I know he says there are a lot of lies going on about his bill. I guess the hospitals of the Nation are lying as well. Let me tell you what they say. Here is what the American Hospital Association said. It says,

America's hospitals treat everyone who walks through their doors, and we are opposed to Mr. ROHRABACHER's bill because it is bad policy, bad policy for hospitals, nurses, doctors, and other health care personnel who work in hospitals, but most importantly it is bad policy for patients.

Rohrabacher's legislation is bad policy because it takes hospitals away from what we do best, caring for and healing our patients. The requirements for reimbursement under the legislation would turn hospital workers into border patrol agents. That is not our jobs. We are caregivers, not cops. And hospital caregivers are already burdened with paperwork which requires at least 30 minutes, often an hour for every patient. The additional burden of policing suspected undocumented immigrants would take health care workers away from their primary mission of healing and caring.

And not only that, it hurts everyone else waiting in that emergency room for care. Because as we are trying to get all this documentation, for which we give these hospitals no funding to do it, we are also taking away from the care of everyone else there, and we are allowing communicable diseases to spread in communities like that. That is outrageous.

This bill should be defeated. It is shameful that it is even on the House floor.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What is shameful is how shameful some of my colleagues are getting the facts totally wrong and do not know what they are talking about. Someone must have briefed them with the wrong information.

This bill does not require our hospitals to gather any significant more information. The information that is being gathered that my colleague is complaining about, what we just heard, the great condemnation of all the questions that must be asked and all the information that must be gathered from this U.S. citizen, who might be an illegal, is already required of the hospital in order to get the funding, the billion dollars, that was set aside for them. It is not required by my bill. It is required in order to get reimbursement.

My bill simply says that if they are going to ask those questions, and they are going to expect to get reimbursed, they also have to ask who the employer is and get a fingerprint or a picture, which they are probably going to have to get in order to be reimbursed in the first place. So the gentleman's complaints are not against 3722. His complaints are that the Federal Government is now going to have an unlimited reimbursement for illegal immigrants and they are going to ask some questions for it. Do not blame 3722.

And let me note this also: we have had an example given to us of an American citizen who is there, and he is being threatened because he has to answer whether or not he is an illegal immigrant or not. The greatest threat to the treatment of American citizens and legal residents is that we are going to spend all of our available health care dollars taking care of illegals who should not be getting that money. The greatest threat to our senior citizens, to our young people is that we have a limited amount of health care dollars and my colleagues want to spend it on people who have come here illegally.

□ 1515

My colleague pointed out this will bring tens of millions of more people here and even a greater drain until the system breaks down.

The bottom line is the people who are in favor of spending our limited dollars on American citizens and a very doable system here that is no more complicated than what the hospitals are

going to have to go through to get reimbursement in the first place should be voting in favor of H.R. 3722. If they want to spend their money on people who came here illegally, rather than our own citizens, waste those dollars, make sure more illegals get in, go ahead and vote against H.R. 3722.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. Seldom has this House had before it a more ill-considered proposal. This legislation purely and simply attempts to turn our frontline medical care providers into Border Patrol police.

Unlike what was just told us by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), this is not their mission. They do not ask these questions now. It is not their professional responsibility. It is not the appropriate role for those committed to saving lives and protecting the health care of our communities.

What does society gain by forcing undocumented aliens to forgo emergency care because, as a practical matter, that will be the result if they are asked these questions on their immigration status? What benefit does it make for a woman in labor not to come in for medical care because she is fearing that she will be deported? And what does society gain by discouraging people with contagious conditions, who may put us all at risk, from going in and getting the diagnosis and treatment they need? Do we want someone who might have SARS to be afraid to go in for treatment?

We need to help our hospitals and emergency systems have the resources to treat all people who are eligible for those services. What we do not need to do is to stretch their resources further on a mission that is not theirs to fill. This is not an appropriate action for Americans or appropriate policy on health care for those in need. That is why all of the hospitals oppose this legislation.

I urge that we oppose this bill.

MAY 7, 2004.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We understand that the House of Representatives is expected to soon consider legislation (H.R. 3722) proposed by Representative Rohrabacher (R-CA). The undersigned organizations, representing America's hospitals and health systems, health care providers, and safety net systems, are united in our opposition to H.R. 3722, the "Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments of 2004," and urge you to oppose this legislation. We believe it will severely undermine Section 1011 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA) and create unnecessary barriers to life saving treatments at hospitals nationwide.

After months of careful deliberation by the Medicare conferees, the Congress and Administration included essential resources for hospitals providing life saving emergency care to undocumented aliens. The undersigned

organizations deeply appreciated the inclusion of Section 1011 in MMA.

We are deeply concerned that H.R. 3722 would weaken Section 1011 by imposing new burdensome requirements on hospitals in order to receive any of the resources from Section 1011. In addition, H.R. 3722 would virtually ensure that illegal immigrants will avoid getting the appropriate and timely life saving health care they need, when they need it. H.R. 3722 could pose a significant public health threat for entire communities because the fear of deportation would inevitably preclude undocumented immigrants from seeking care for communicable disease until these individuals are extremely ill.

Hospitals provide care to anyone who walks through their doors,—regardless of race, ethnicity or citizenship status,—twenty-four hours each day, seven days a week. That is the role of community hospitals. Rep. Rohrabacher's legislation, however, seeks to create a new role for hospitals in their communities—that of border patrol agents. In order to qualify for Section 1011 funding, the Rohrabacher legislation would require that hospitals demand and upload personal data—including such "identifiers" as fingerprints and digital photographs—on undocumented aliens to an electronic database set up by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) for deportation purposes. Furthermore, the bill requires hospitals to retain original documents and data for a period of at least 5 years, thus imposing additional paperwork on an already overwhelmed system.

We do not believe this is in the best interest of the patients we serve and the nurses and physicians that provide emergency care. Today's health care delivery system in very fast-paced and in an emergency situation, the urgency of providing life-saving care takes precedence over anything else. Requiring hospitals to collect these data diverts us from doing our job of caring for patients. Hospitals do not have the expertise or the resources to interrogate and investigate patients in the pressured environment of an emergency.

We respectfully ask that you oppose this legislation should it come up for a vote.

Sincerely,

Federation of American Hospitals.
American Hospital Association.
National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems.
Association of American Medical Colleges.
Catholic Health Association of the United States.
National Association of Children's Hospitals.
VHA Inc.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,
Chicago, IL, May 13, 2004.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER HASTERT: On behalf of the American Medical Association (AMA) and its physician and medical student members, I am writing in strong opposition to H.R. 3722, the "Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments of 2004" (Rohrabacher, R-CA). This bill would amend Section 1011 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA) to impose conditions on Federal reimbursement of emergency health services furnished to undocumented individuals and require physicians and other health care providers to report undocumented patients to the Department of Homeland Security so that they could be deported.

This provision would effectively negate Section 1011 of the MMA which will provide

funds to reimburse physicians and hospitals for treating undocumented individuals. The AMA has been working with the U.S.-Mexico Border Health Commission and state medical societies in Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, and California, as well as the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, to determine the best way to implement Section 1011. Physicians in these states believe these funds are critically needed to provide necessary health services to undocumented individuals who cannot afford to pay their medical bills.

This bill would effectively turn physicians and other health care providers into border patrol agents. By requiring physicians to report patients and perhaps withhold necessary care, this bill would in effect require physicians to violate their Hippocratic Oath. Finally, by discouraging undocumented individuals from seeking medical care for problems that might cause harm to others, such as communicable diseases, this bill could have very negative effects on existing public health efforts.

The AMA urges you to oppose this bill when it is considered on the House floor.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL D. MAVES, MD, MBA,
Executive Vice President, CEO.

FAMILIESUSA,

Washington, DC, May 17, 2004.

DEAR MEMBER: On behalf of FamiliesUSA, the voice for America's health care consumers, I am urging you to reject the Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments of 2004, H.R. 3722. This bill would require hospitals to report to the Department of Homeland Security the name of any undocumented immigrant who receives care within two hours of their treatment. If adopted, this provision would have damaging effects on the care of all Americans, especially on the Hispanic population.

If they are faced with fear of deportation if they present at a hospital, undocumented immigrants who are in need of treatment may not seek it. As a result, health problems may go untreated, endangering the health of the individual, and also creating potentially serious public health problems. Confusion about the applicability of this proposal may deter even some legal immigrants from seeking treatment. What is more, our nation's hospitals and health care providers will be forced to divert their time and attention from saving lives to acting as immigration officials, resulting in diminished care in the hospitals.

We urge you to vote against this legislation which creates a public health danger.

Sincerely,

RON POLLACK,
Executive Director.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, again we hear this bogus argument that this bill is going to create more paperwork. The paperwork and the questions that we are talking about are required by hospitals who are going to be trying to get reimbursement through this billion dollar fund, which was snuck into the Medicare package with a back room deal, I might add. It is not required by my legislation; it is required to get reimbursement. If a hospital does not want to be reimbursed, they do not have to ask any questions, they can do whatever they want.

Let me note, all contagious diseases have been exempted by this legislation.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN).

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat, my good friend from Long Beach and Orange, California, is absolutely incorrect. The hospitals do not have to ask this question of emergency care patients. We do not know what the emergency is when they come in, if it is a communicable disease that they are suffering from such as SARS. Hospitals do not ask this question. They give care to the patients.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is painful for me to rise in opposition to this legislation. The gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) and I have worked together on immigration issues for years, and I will take a back seat to no one when it comes to the issue of protecting our borders. I have had legislation to dramatically increase the size of the Border Patrol, and I believe it is very important for us to deal with the issue of illegal immigration.

But I happen to have come to the conclusion, while I support the right to offer this legislation, I believe it is wrong. My concern is that it will send a message to many people who may not know that they have a contagious disease that the threat of deportation is on the horizon. Safety and security for the American people is our number one priority.

I strongly support anything that we are going to do to ensure that the American people are safe and secure, that we are able to protect our families. My concern is that someone who could conceivably see the threat of deportation as they go through this process, and when I think about the process of State and local governments shouldering the responsibility of having to deal with possible incarceration of these people, the cost is tremendous and the possibility of the spread of disease is very great.

I appreciate the fact that there is an exemption, but people may not know whether or not they have a contagious disease, and it is for that reason I think the right thing for us to do now is to oppose this legislation and work in a broad way to deal with the challenge of illegal immigration, which is a very serious and important one for us.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Let me note that if we really want to have the spread of disease in this country, let us set ourselves up as the HMO for the whole world. Let us make sure that everybody in the world knows that if they can get their kids to the United States, we will take care of them, and see how many diseases we are going to get.

That is what is happening in California right now. Diseases are beginning to materialize because people have brought their children and brought their seniors as well to come to the United States to be treated. We have got to end that syndrome because the money is coming directly from the

health care dollars that should go to our own citizens, and it is luring more people with disease into our country.

This is a catastrophe. The best way to prevent it is to vote yes on H.R. 3722.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD).

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 3722, and I would note if safety and security is the main concern of our country, then perhaps we ought to start at the borders and enforce the laws that we have on the books. Were we doing that, this legislation would not be needed.

Between 1990 and 2000, the number of illegal aliens in Georgia rose 300 percent. That was from 33,000 to 226,000 according to the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Nationwide, the estimates of how many illegal aliens live in our country range from 8 to 11 million, it sort of depends on who one talks to. Those that do work do not have health insurance, and technically the law forbids them access to Medicaid.

However, document fraud led many to question how many illegal aliens are fraudulently obtaining Medicaid today where we have a problem for our own citizens in every State having enough money to take care of Americans.

Last month, the Atlanta Business Chronicle reported that Grady Memorial Hospital in Atlanta is on the verge of closing its doors. Grady treats more illegal aliens than any other hospital in the State of Georgia. It only gets 7 percent of its revenues from patients with private insurance.

In 2002, the State of Georgia paid \$58 million in emergency Medicaid reimbursements to hospitals that treated more than 15,200 illegal aliens, according to the Georgia Department of Community Health. About 75 percent of the funds went to pregnant women delivering babies. The total was a 33 percent increase from 2001 when the State paid \$43.4 million for the care of 12,000 people.

Mr. Speaker, I will have to say, if we do not pass this bill, it is absolutely going to break our hospitals. We do have a billion dollars that was put into the Medicare bill for reimbursement to our hospitals for illegal alien care. That means, to obtain those dollars, and all hospitals, particularly rural, desperately need those dollars, hospitals have to ask the question: Are you or are you not a citizen? It is that simple.

I do not happen to think that we have a pot full of money that is so big that everybody can get everything that they want. We do not. I see it in Medicaid today for U.S. citizens. There is not enough money in there now. We have to be particular about how we spend that money. And first and foremost, it must be spent on the American citizen, not someone who started out the day breaking Federal law.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to be talking about that more than anything else.

This Congress is responsible for that. We passed a law saying that people cannot sneak across our borders. If Members do not believe that ought to be the law, if they think that is not important, then stand up and repeal that and we will look at this whole scenario, including health care, in a different vein.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD letters from various hospitals and organizations in opposition to this bill.

MAY 13, 2004.

RE: H.R. 3722 (ROHRABACHER)—OPPOSE

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN SOLIS: On behalf of Private Essential Access Community Hospitals, Inc. (PEACH, Inc.), representing 37 private safety net hospitals across California, I am writing to express our strong opposition to H.R. 3722 (Rohrabacher), which would require hospitals to document the immigration status of those seeking emergency care. We ask for your NO vote when this measure comes before the House this month.

In California and throughout the nation, private safety net hospitals are a vital segment of the safety net, providing critical health care services to diverse populations within their communities, including undocumented immigrants. PEACH hospitals consider it part of their mission to provide essential services to all who seek care regardless of any barrier, including ability to pay or immigration status.

We have two primary concerns about H.R. 3722. First and foremost, our hospitals are in the business, socially, morally and economically, of saving lives and protecting the health care of their communities. They are not in the business of serving as immigration officers. This is neither the role of hospitals nor an effective use of extremely limited hospital funds and staff time—particularly in an emergency department setting.

Second, we believe that H.R. 3722, rather than discouraging the tide of illegal immigration, would instead have a negative impact on public health care. Individuals who are in need of emergency care, including those with contagious conditions and/or who are seriously ill, would be forced to avoid treatment in order to avoid the threat of deportation. This would likely result in the spread of serious and contagious conditions to the greater community creating a health care epidemic as well as a secondary wave of patients needing costly emergency care.

PEACH appreciates the desire to stem illegal immigration, but H.R. 3722 sets a very dangerous precedent by using health care providers as adjunct Border Patrol. We urge you to defeat this ill-advised measure, and appreciate your consideration of the views of those who are on the front lines of health care every day.

Sincerely,

CATHERINE K. DOUGLAS,
President and CEO, PEACH, Inc.

On behalf of:

California Hospital Medical Center, Central Valley General Hospital, Citrus Valley Medical Center—Inter-Community Campus, City of Hope National Medical Center, College Hospital Cerritos, College Hospital Costa Mesa, Community Hospital of San Bernardino, Community and Mission Hospitals of Huntington Park, Daniel Freeman Memorial Hospital, Fountain Valley Regional Hospital and Medical Center.

MAY 7, 2004.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: We understand that the House of Representatives is expected to soon consider legislation (H.R. 3722) proposed by Representative Rohrabacher (R-CA). The undersigned organizations, representing America's hospitals and health systems, health care providers, and safety net systems, are united in our opposition to H.R. 3722, the "Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments of 2004," and urge you to oppose this legislation. We believe it will severely undermine Section 1011 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 (MMA) and create unnecessary barriers to life saving treatments at hospitals nationwide.

After months of careful deliberation by the Medicare conferees, the Congress and Administration included essential resources for hospitals providing life saving emergency care to undocumented aliens. The undersigned organizations deeply appreciated the inclusion of Section 1011 in MMA.

We are deeply concerned that H.R. 3722 would weaken Section 1011 by imposing new burdensome requirements on hospitals in order to receive any of the resources from Section 1011. In addition, H.R. 3722 would virtually ensure that illegal immigrants will avoid getting the appropriate and timely life saving health care they need, when they need it. H.R. 3722 could pose a significant public health threat for entire communities because the fear of deportation would inevitably preclude undocumented immigrants from seeking care for communicable diseases until these individuals are extremely ill.

Hospitals provide care to anyone who walks through their doors, regardless of race, ethnicity or citizenship status—twenty-four hours each day, seven days a week. That is the role of community hospitals. Rep. Rohrabacher's legislation, however, seeks to create a new role for hospitals in their communities—that of border patrol agents. In order to qualify for Section 1011 funding, the Rohrabacher legislation would require that hospitals demand and upload personal data—including such "identifiers" as fingerprints and digital photographs—on undocumented aliens to an electronic database set up by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) for deportation purposes. Furthermore, the bill requires hospitals to retain original documents and data for a period of at least 5 years, thus imposing additional paperwork on an already overwhelmed system.

We do not believe this is in the best interest of the patients we serve and the nurses and physicians that provide emergency care. Today's health care delivery system is very fast-paced and in an emergency situation, the urgency of providing life-saving care take precedence over anything else. Requiring hospitals to collect these data diverts us from doing our job of caring for patients. Hospitals do not have the expertise or the resources to interrogate and investigate patients in the pressured environment of an emergency.

We respectfully ask that you oppose this legislation should it come up for a vote.

Sincerely,

Federation of American Hospitals.
American Hospital Association.
National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems.

Association of American Medical Colleges.
Catholic Health Association of the United States.

National Association of Children's Hospitals.

VHA Inc.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3722, a bill that presents more questions than answers about providing efficient and effective health care treatment to undocumented immigrants.

I share the concern about lapses in our country's immigration program, and I support measures such as biometric visas and other advanced technologies to more accurately control who enters our country. However, I am very concerned about this particular legislation, as I fear that it will serve only to undermine the efficiency and effectiveness of our public health system with little benefit to our Border Protection Services.

Mr. Speaker, we are talking about health here. The reason that I hesitate to support H.R. 3722 is twofold. First, funding was included in last year's Medicare reform act for the simple purpose of assisting State and local health authorities to cover the cost of providing health services to illegal immigrants.

This provision demonstrates both our Nation's compassion by ensuring public health to all walks of life and also its commitment to providing our medical community with the necessary resources to do their jobs. Adding more regulatory and financial burdens, such as those outlined in H.R. 3722, will increase costs.

Secondly, I am concerned that immigration paperwork will either prevent or delay critical health care services to immigrants in general. Documentation can be dealt with after immediate medical procedures are rendered. Because of these concerns, I urge my colleagues not to support H.R. 3722.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, we have been asked to vote on a lot of really bad ideas presented by the majority, but I have to say this is clearly one of the worst.

This bill, regardless what the gentleman says, would require doctors and nurses to be part of enforcing Federal immigration laws while threatening the health and well-being of our communities.

But do not take my word for it. The American Medical Association says "This bill would effectively turn physicians and other health care providers into Border Patrol agents. By requiring physicians to report patients and perhaps withhold necessary care, this bill would, in effect, require physicians to violate the Hippocratic Oath. Finally, by discouraging undocumented individuals from seeking medical care for problems that might cause harm to others, such as communicable diseases, this bill would have very negative effects on existing public health efforts."

I know the gentleman goes to great lengths to say what is not in his bill is not in his bill, but these are the experts that are required to actually carry out this law. This bill is so ill-advised, it could allow for a woman in active labor to be deported. That is not America.

We should vote "no" on the legislation.

□ 1530

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

We keep hearing the bogus arguments. This requires the doctors to ask so many questions; we know now that is not true. Only the people who are trying to get reimbursed from that billion-dollar fund are going to ask the questions. This bill has minimal added questions. Two. Who is your employer and then taking a picture or getting a fingerprint which might be required in order to get reimbursed in the first place.

Do my colleagues on the other side of the aisle really believe in unlimited treatment for illegal immigrants without asking any questions? Is that what we are going to do? Who benefits from that? Certainly the illegal immigrant does and the tens of millions of other illegal immigrants who come into our country seeking health care, yes, they are going to benefit.

Who else benefits? The employer who does not want to offer health care to his employees. That is who benefits. That is who is being subsidized here. Behind the scenes when you get to the Chamber of Commerce and these other people opposing this, that is what their motive is. They do not want to offer health care to their employees. This gives the government the subsidy to subsidize them hiring people at below minimum wage level and, in fact, off the books at times. If you want to combat illegal immigration, this is the way to start; and it does not add any new paperwork or any new questions for the doctors.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ).

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, envision this: an undocumented immigrant or a legal permanent resident or even a U.S. citizen suffers severe abdominal pain and finds himself in the emergency room of a nearby hospital. The first order of business for the emergency physician, nurse, or whoever is attending the patient is not to ask them where it hurts and do a physical exam to see if their life is in imminent danger, but to ask their immigration status and get a sworn statement to that effect.

If that patient at that particular moment cannot prove their legal status, that same doctor must make the choice not to provide care to this person, or they must at least report them to the immigration officials before providing lifesaving treatment. I ask you, what kind of choice is that? What happens if that same immigrant decides not to seek care because of the potential consequences and what could become a burst appendix leads to infection, more expensive care or possibly

even death? There is no humanity in the choice you are asking health care workers to make in this circumstance. They are no longer healers, but immigration law enforcers.

What is even more appalling is that the Republican leadership chooses to pursue this course of action to deal with this country's immigration problem rather than look at the comprehensive immigration reform measures that have been introduced in the House. If the Republicans are serious about reforming immigration, then take a look at the bill the Democrats introduced which would bring a sense of order and reason to the influx of immigrants into this country.

Let us not jeopardize our entire public health system in this misguided attempt to bring down health care costs and deport undocumented workers. This bill is an affront to our health care professionals and to the immigrant community in this country which would no longer be able to get care without presenting their green card first.

I urge a "no" vote on this legislation.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds. This bill does not require the first order of business to ask questions. This bill says if you want to be reimbursed from that billion dollar fund, yes, you are going to have to ask some questions, anyway, and adds one other question: Who is your employer? It does not require the doctors to turn anybody into the INS, although we have heard that over and over again in this debate. It does not require that. It requires their files to be available to the INS and to the Department of Homeland Security. It is those agencies that then follow through. The doctors do not have to report anything. It just has to be available on a computer.

Communicable diseases, we keep talking about that, that also is wrong. The bill exempts communicable diseases. Let us talk about the real issue, illegal immigration. How many services are we going to give people until we get tens of millions of more immigrating into our country?

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3722. I am appalled that the Republican majority would bring such a mean-spirited and discriminatory bill to the floor of this House for a vote. Under current law, hospitals can receive reimbursement for emergency services they provide to uninsured people, including immigrants. Our current law is a responsible public health and safety policy. It is humane. In this country, we do not deny emergency medical treatment because someone is poor, uninsured, or born in another country.

The proposed H.R. 3722 would turn hospital emergency rooms into immigration processing facilities or, worse, detention facilities. Hospitals would be

required to collect sworn statements of citizenship from individuals suffering medical emergencies. Hospitals would have to collect fingerprints or other biometric identifiers of all emergency patients. Under this proposed H.R. 3722, they would have to submit the information to the Department of Homeland Security and store it for a minimum of 5 years.

It seems to me there are a few Republicans who want to make people afraid to go to the hospital. This legislation will have deadly results in many of our congressional districts, especially in my district, a border district. We have daily trade and commerce across the border. Businesses depend on it. Fear will keep people from seeking life-saving medical treatment. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to send a message to those who would sow fear and hate, by strongly opposing H.R. 3722.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, we face a record national budget deficit in this country. We face a record national debt of over \$7 trillion, which we cannot leave to our children. We face in Harris County, Texas, spending over \$100 million a year providing health care to illegal aliens.

This bill that the gentleman from California has filed, which I strongly support, only requires hospitals that are seeking reimbursement from that billion dollars to identify whether the individual in question is a citizen or not. A hospital is not eligible to be reimbursed unless they are already treating somebody who is an alien.

The gentleman from California's bill, and I have read it very carefully, requires that this question be asked of everybody who is presented to a hospital for medical treatment if they are an alien. The gentleman from California's legislation is based on common sense. We must make sure that we balance the budget in this country. The budget deficit is now over \$500 billion. Uncontrolled immigration is a national security issue. We must control our borders. It is a financial security issue for the sake of our kids and our grandchildren.

I think the gentleman from California has come forward with a commonsense proposal that we can move forward on to the Senate and that we could deal with in conference committee. If opponents of this bill have better ideas, let them offer them as amendments. I strongly support the legislation and encourage my colleagues to vote for this bill in the interest of national security and the financial security of the future of this Nation.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, our border communities face some tremendous health care challenges. This bill would

simply add to their burdens. It seems to confuse TV shows, trying to merge "ER" with "NYPD Blue." It would involve our health care workers, our physicians, and instead of being physicians, it would turn them into Homeland Security deputies. When a doctor asks the nurse for a patient's vital signs, it ought not to mean fingerprints and a visa entry number.

Think of it. A parent who is rushing a child to the emergency room with an excessively high fever, with a rattlesnake bite, with an accidental-fall injury is thinking, "can I get my child to the doctor on time?", not "did I bring my employment history, my immigration status, my financial status?" Some of our border physicians face such immense burdens. That physician is thinking, "how can I take care and save the life and the future of this young person?" Involving doctors and nurses in the red tape of the federal bureaucracy jeopardizes all of us, because these viruses and bacteria are equal opportunity pathogens. Tuberculosis, typhus and hepatitis do not ask for your immigration status. All of us could be adversely affected if fear forces people not to seek treatment at a medical facility.

It is also important to consider that, finally, there is a small amount of relief for our border communities. Starr County, one of the poorest counties in the entire country, ought not to have to bear all of the cost of our federal immigration policy, nor should physicians in Mission or McAllen bear the entire cost of a policy that is federal in nature. Finally, there is some assistance on the way under legislation approved last year. Let us not destroy it with this bill. The Border Health Caucus has been leading the way in trying to find solutions to address the care of all the people in the border region.

As we discuss immigrants, some here see numbers, but these are real live human beings that face crisis every bit as real as that of someone like myself who has lived here forever. This is a chance for groups to come together to stop bad legislation and start us on the way to solving our health care problems along the border.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3722. Hospitals, doctors, and nurses ought to be free to do the incredibly important jobs we all depend on them to do, that is, to save human life. Sadly, this bill would help prevent that. In turn, this bill will hurt patients.

On a recent New Year's Eve in a hospital in my district, an undocumented woman gave birth to a girl. That girl, by birth, is a U.S. citizen but her mother remains not. If this bill had been law, that mother would have likely faced deportation. If that mother were deported, in all likelihood her baby

girl, a U.S. citizen, would have gone with her. In essence that baby girl, a U.S. citizen, would have been deported.

If this bill had been law when this mother went into labor, there is also a good chance that she would not have sought care at all. I ask you, if a pregnant woman is afraid to seek out care to help herself and her baby who, when born, will become a U.S. citizen, who suffers? If a person with a communicable disease does not seek treatment, who suffers? A communicable disease does not ask whether you are a U.S. citizen or not. If a person with a chronic ailment does not seek treatment until the condition worsens, requiring emergency care and taking up a scarce bed in the ER, who suffers?

The reality is that this bill endangers the health of the undocumented, and this bill endangers the health of the documented as well. I would have thought that the sponsor of this bill would have learned from the ill-fated proposition 187 in his home State of California that led to scares and communicable disease outbreaks throughout the entire population, especially school children, because some people were denied care.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, this is not the way to deal with immigration problems. I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3722. As a matter of fact, I am surprised at the gentleman from California. Does he not understand that this would transform our health care personnel into the border patrol? This bill will have a disastrous impact on emergency care and community hospitals throughout America.

Mr. Speaker, hospitals, doctors, nurses, and health care personnel are trained to be caregivers, not adjuncts of immigration law enforcement. Do our health care personnel not have enough to do already without imposing this huge reporting burden on an already overextended health care system?

Mr. Speaker, forcing health care personnel to start taking fingerprints and snapping pictures of patients suspected of being undocumented when perhaps they need a blood transfusion or something to save their lives will cause people who urgently need medical care to refrain from seeking such care because they fear that they may die trying to get service or they will be deported. We all know that in health care an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. When any persons delay their access to health care, their medical condition is much worse.

I would urge a "no" vote on this bill. It is unsound public policy. I am ashamed of it. Do not do it.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, I urge all my colleagues to join the hospitals, doctors, nurses,

business owners, women's groups, children advocates, civil rights organizations, and, yes, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to stand strongly against this bill. We cannot let this bill be the message to send to the American people about what the U.S. Congress thinks about the role of hospitals. We cannot let this bill be the message we send to the American people about what we think about immigrants, hard-working, tax-paying immigrants who come to this country for a better life, just as my parents did some 50 years ago. In fact, the average immigrant contributes about \$1,800 more in taxes annually than he or she receives in any form of benefit, because they do not collect. We can do better than this bill. I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 3722.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to seriously consider this vote, and I would remind them that there are people all over the United States, especially their constituents, who are looking at this vote as a determinant as to whether or not we believe that illegal immigration is something that should remain uncontrolled and should continue in the years ahead, or whether we should start doing something about it.

There is a seething among the American people, among the working class and middle-class people. They know that illegal immigration has had a horrible impact on their lives. It has brought down wages. We actually had a policy that permitted unlimited illegal immigration into our country, and because of that, working class people do not make as much money as they did before.

Now we have a situation where illegal immigrants who go for emergency treatment, we are being told that we have to give them unrestricted and unlimited treatment, health treatment, and it is going to be paid for by the Federal Government. But that is not true of U.S. citizens. What about those middle-class, working-class people? They are out of work; they do not have insurance.

In this situation today, we have created the perverse priority that our government is reimbursing hospitals and helping illegals, but we will not do it for our own citizens.

We have a horrible problem in this country with illegal immigration. It is hurting many people's lives. Yes, rich corporations in the Chamber of Commerce, they get to hire people who are not even paying taxes half the time. They do not have to provide health insurance anymore because there are all these illegals willing to work anyway. That is very damaging to the American people.

Also we are spending billions of dollars here already on cancer treatments,

organ transplants and genetic problems. We are spending about \$10 billion on this every year.

This legislation says the only free treatment that somebody gets at an emergency center, illegal or not illegal, is if their life is under a threatening situation. I think even that is very generous of us in the United States. Interestingly enough, if someone goes through the process of being a legal immigrant, they do not get their health care covered, they do not get it reimbursed by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, unless H.R. 3722 passes, we have set up the priority of helping illegal immigrants. Do not think that will not attract tens of millions more illegal immigrants to this country who have diseases that need to be treated. That makes sense. Think about it. This is common sense.

The American people are waiting to see whether or not we are going to use our scarce health dollars to take care of our senior citizens, to take care of our own people, to take care of our own little kids, or whether we are going to attract tens of millions of new people here and give that money away to strangers.

This is not mean-spirited. This is down-in-your-heart. We love everyone in this country. We have a diverse country, every race and religion. It is that love for each other that keeps us together. We have to care more about our own people, and that is not mean spirited, than we do about people that come here illegally.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my friends and colleagues to support H.R. 3722.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3722, the Undocumented Alien Medical Assistance Amendments of 2004.

The Medicare Prescription Drug Act that this Congress passed last year includes \$1 billion to reimburse hospitals for their uncompensated care of undocumented immigrants. We included that funding because we recognized the strain hospitals experience in providing uncompensated emergency medical care to the uninsured. H.R. 3722 undoes this goodwill by requiring hospitals to enforce immigration law, refuse emergency medical treatment to immigrants, and have them deported.

Many American citizen and immigrant families who are living, working and paying taxes in the United States are unable to obtain health care coverage for themselves or their families. At a time when health care has become a national crisis due to the large number of uninsured, we need to take steps to heal more, not less.

Undocumented immigrants are not covered by employer health care plans, and they are systemically excluded from public health insurance programs such as Medicaid and SCHIP. We cannot encourage immigrants to refuse to seek medical care due to fear of deportation. It makes no sense. Do we want outbreaks of tuberculosis and other diseases and epidemics common in the developing world right here in America? That is likely to happen if immigrants are refused emergency medical care. This is why hospitals nationwide, the

American Medical Association, and physicians of all types are urging this Congress to reject this attempt to inject an anti-immigrant agenda into the field of medicine. Besides public health, H.R. 3722 fails on a number of fronts.

For instance, it would force hospitals to choose which law they will violate—the one that requires them to provide medical assistance to anyone that requires it, or H.R. 3722 and its requirement that we even deport women while in labor.

The Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act requires that any patient, without regard to race, sex, creed, immigration status, or ability to pay, be given appropriate emergency care to stabilize his or her condition. This law is consistent with the Hippocratic Oath, and is meant to ensure that no person in our country will be denied emergency medical care.

I cannot support legislation that could punish employers that unknowingly hire immigrants with fraudulent green cards by forcing them to pay the medical bills. There is no precedent for holding employers liable for injuries and illnesses that are not work-related. Also, I fear that employers will discourage their employees from seeking treatment for any illness.

Are we prepared to possibly read stories of immigrant laborers found injured or dead on sidewalks? It is not difficult to imagine immigrants being left behind by fearful employers trying to avoid the scrutiny of federal immigration enforcement officials.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3722 is a Pandora's box that our Nation cannot open. H.R. 3722 will endanger the health of everyone in America. It will force doctors to violate their oaths and the law, require hospitals to enforce immigration law, and it will encourage employers to force their immigrant laborers to never seek medical treatment.

I urge my colleagues to please oppose this misguided proposal.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3722, the Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments Act. This draconian bill would convert our nation's hospitals from health care providers to border patrol officers.

If enacted, it would seriously endanger the health and lives of immigrants who need emergency care—and jeopardize our nation's entire public health system in the process. This bill would deny critical federal reimbursement to hospitals for the emergency care of undocumented immigrants unless the hospital determined patients' immigration status and obtained employer information for transmission to the Department of Homeland Security for purposes of beginning deportation procedures for undocumented workers.

Today, the House Republicans are proving that President George Bush's promise to reform America's immigration system is not real and is nothing more than an election year ploy to gain votes from immigrants. If President Bush were concerned about the well-being of immigrants, he would publicly denounce this bill and would have made clear to the House Republican leadership that it did not deserve to see the light of day. He's done no such thing.

This bill also clearly demonstrates the Republican Leadership's willingness to sacrifice the health needs and safety of America's immigrants to ensure their large donors—the

pharmaceutical companies and health insurance industry—get their billions of dollars in subsidies from the Medicare bill. HR 3722 is on the floor today because of a commitment the House Republican leadership made to the bill's author in exchange for his vote for the Republican Medicare bill when it narrowly passed the House last November. Its yet another example of the dirty dealing it took to get their Medicare bill through Congress.

If enacted, this policy would create a chilling effect in which both documented and undocumented workers would fear coming into hospitals for critical medical services. The result would be immigrants suffering from more serious health complications and eventually leading to the unnecessary deaths of many immigrants.

This bill would also threaten the public health of this nation. Since this bill would surely drive a significant proportion of this country's population away from seeking needed medical care, it would undermine our public health system's ability to track and prevent the spread of contagious disease. Clearly, such a change would impact health care beyond the immigrant community.

Instead of limiting health care, this Congress should be finding ways to expand health care to the 44 million Americans without health insurance. This bill would take us in the exact opposite direction. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill and to protect our hospitals' abilities to continue to provide medical care to those who need it. To do otherwise is to endanger the health of us all.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3722, the "Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments of 2004." This bill would amend Section 1011 of the Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act of 2003 MMA. The purpose of Section 1011 of the MMA is to provide funds for reimbursing physicians and hospitals for treating undocumented individuals who cannot afford to pay their medical bills. H.R. 3722 would impose conditions on the Federal reimbursement of emergency health services furnished to these individuals, and it would require physicians and other health care providers to report the undocumented patients to the Department of Homeland Security so that they could be deported.

H.R. 3722 would require physicians and other health care providers to be part time border patrol agents. According to the American Medical Association AMA, by requiring physicians to report patients and perhaps withhold necessary care, this bill would in effect require physicians to violate their Hippocratic Oath. The AMA also has expressed concern over the fact that by discouraging undocumented individuals from seeking medical care for problems that might cause harm to others, such as communicable diseases, H.R. 3722 could have very negative effects on existing public health efforts.

I share the concerns of the AMA. The fear of deportation inevitably would preclude undocumented immigrants from seeking care for communicable diseases until they are extremely ill.

It is important to remember that community hospitals must provide care to anyone who walks through their doors, regardless of race, ethnicity or citizenship status, and they must do this twenty-four hours each day, seven

days a week. In order to qualify for Section 1011 funding, the Rohrabacher legislation would require the hospitals also to demand and upload personal data. This would include the uploading of fingerprints and digital photographs for undocumented aliens to an electronic database set up by the Department of Homeland Security DHS for deportation purposes. Furthermore, the bill would require hospitals to retain original documents and data for a period of at least 5 years, thus imposing additional paperwork on an already overburdened system.

Today's health care delivery system is very fast-paced, and, in an emergency situation, the urgency of providing life-saving care takes precedence over anything else. Requiring hospitals to collect immigration data would divert time and attention from caring for patients. Hospitals do not have the expertise or the resources to interrogate and investigate patients in the pressured environment of an emergency room.

It also would divert funds that could be used to provide health care services for some of America's estimated 44 million uninsured patients. A substantial portion of these funds would have to be used to establish and implement an expensive new immigration enforcement program for our already underfunded, overburdened community hospitals.

More than 200 organizations are opposed to this bill, including the American Hospital Association, Federation of American Hospitals, National Association of Children's Hospitals, National Association of Public Hospitals and Health Systems, Catholic Health Association, Association of American Medical Colleges, National Immigration Forum, National Immigration Law Center, Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, National Council of La Raza, League of United Latin American Citizens, MALDEF, National Asian Pacific American Legal Consortium, Asian and Pacific Islander American Health Forum, Families USA, AFL-CIO and Catholic Charities.

This legislation would weaken federal Emergency Medical Treatment and Active Labor Act EMTALA obligations by redefining the circumstances under which hospitals are required to treat patients who are undocumented immigrants. Such a policy would create a dangerous situation for all patients because physicians would be required to impose differing standards of care based on whether they determine a patient to be in the country legally or not. By necessity, emergency department professionals must be afforded the latitude necessary to provide treatment based solely on which treatment is medically appropriate for the patient and without regard for immigration status.

It is in the best interests of all patients, documented and undocumented alike, that medical staff be permitted to focus their attention on caring for patients and providing necessary medical treatment rather than on assisting the federal government in enforcing the immigration laws of this country. I urge you therefore to vote against H.R. 3722, the "Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments of 2004."

Mr. ISSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 3722, the "Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments of 2004."

I commend the gentleman from California for his intent in introducing this legislation. It

attempts to address legitimate concerns that exist about widespread illegal immigration and the cost of providing services to those aliens. This legislation requires hospital emergency rooms to collect citizenship, immigration status, financial data, and employer information from aliens seeking emergency care and transmit that information to the Department of Homeland Security in order to receive reimbursement for services. H.R. 3722 also requires an employer who knowingly employs an illegal alien to pay the cost of providing emergency care to the alien. As a representative of the same state as the gentleman from California, I understand the factors that led to him draft this legislation.

However, I am disturbed that this legislation has come to the floor of the House without proper consideration, that it has not been fully vetted through the Committee process. I am a member of the committee of jurisdiction, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and this legislation has not had a hearing or a mark up before our committee. Before we make a change in the law, before we enact legislation that will impact the operation of every emergency room in America, I think we ought to have a thorough debate on the issue, hear from the doctors and hospital administrators and others who will be impacted by this legislation, and who will bear the burden of implementation.

I am opposing this legislation today, with the hopes that the gentleman will continue to pursue solutions to a serious problem, and that we would have an opportunity to hold hearings on this issue in the committees of jurisdiction and address it through the normal committee process. This will give us the opportunity to perfect legislation in order to make it fair and practical for hospital emergency rooms and the patients they serve.

I thank you for the opportunity to speak, applaud the good intentions of the gentleman from California, and respectfully urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill at this time.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is not healthy unless everyone is. I rise in strong opposition to the Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments.

It is true that hospitals in San Diego, Imperial County and throughout the border region need Federal assistance to pay for the uncompensated care they provide. Instead of debating H.R. 3722, however, I would prefer to debate and vote on my Pay Up! Act, H.R. 2848, aimed at offering full Federal reimbursement to hospitals for the service they provide to undocumented patients. My bill would not force nurses and doctors and other medical professionals to suddenly become de facto immigration officials.

Unfortunately, the dangerous legislation that we are considering today would do exactly that: it would deny Federal reimbursement to emergency health service providers unless they agree to also serve as immigration agents.

As California's Border Congressman, I can tell you this legislation would be a disaster for border communities. It would put an extra burden on our already overworked health care professionals, as they scramble to find the resources to collect and process patients' immigration information, biometric identifiers and financial data. This legislation will lead to fear and confusion among both documented and undocumented immigrant families, discour-

aging them from getting necessary medical attention for children, pregnant women, the elderly and others. In fact, this legislation could put everyone's health at risk. The University of California at San Diego Medical Center has warned that this bill "could undermine public health by deterring those with contagious diseases from seeking care."

This bill puts the lives of immigrants at risk. It puts our health care services at risk. It puts our public health at risk.

On behalf of California's border communities, I urge my colleagues to not force doctors to spend their time figuring out which patients are in good standing with our complex immigration laws. I urge my colleagues to not force immigrant families to skip treatment for life-threatening medical problems because they fear deportation. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments of 2004, H.R. 3722, because it will place a new burden on already struggling emergency health care systems nationwide and will deter immigrants and their family members from seeking much needed health services.

It is interesting to note that this month, at medical school graduations nationwide, a new community of physicians were called upon to take the Hippocratic Oath, which remains a sacredly held principle to the medical community today. Unfortunately H.R. 3722 would allow hospitals which receive federal funding to decide whether or not they would like to make emergency medical services available to certain immigrants, even if they are suffering from an emergency medical condition. This is a right that hospitals and other health care organizations do not want, as evidenced by the strong opposition of the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association and countless other public health organizations. This seems to be in direct conflict of the Hippocratic Oath and will deny basic medical services to some of the most vulnerable of our society.

In Northern Virginia, which encompasses my congressional district, the INOVA Health System serves nearly 400,000 residents a year and has about 240,000 visitors to its emergency rooms alone. The emergency room personnel at INOVA hospitals are some of the same nurses and doctors who serve as our First Responders and were certainly heroic on September 11th in aiding the victims of the Pentagon attack.

Proponents of H.R. 3722 claim that this measure will help to lower the cost of health care in our country, but in reality, will do little to alleviate the growing cost of health care needs and will force hospitals to expand staff and technological resources to implement the reporting requirements such as obtaining signed statements relating to citizenship, immigration status, address, financial data and current employee status as well as purchase a digital electronic biometric identifier.

I am greatly disappointed that the House Republican Leadership would bring to the floor for a vote, a measure which strives to deny even basic health services to some of the most vulnerable in our society, while our military is working hard to establish health services for citizens in some of the most war-torn

and poverty-ridden countries in the world. H.R. 3722 will do little to address the important issue of rising health care costs and its intent seems to have been influenced more by political considerations than sound policy. I urge all my colleagues from both sides of the aisle to vote against the Undocumented Alien Emergency Medical Assistance Amendments of 2004.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 3722 because this bill places an undue burden on our hospitals to be the judge and law enforcement officer for our country's immigration policies. I agree with the sponsor of this legislation that we need to stop illegal immigration but we need to do that by giving immigration officers more resources to find, detain, and deport illegal immigrants. We need to redouble our efforts on our borders and aggressively prevent illegal immigration, but should not shift the responsibility of enforcing our immigration policy onto our health care professionals.

The problem with this bill is that it targets the reimbursement of hospitals that provide care to injured or sick undocumented aliens. This legislation withholds reimbursements from hospitals that do not collect and share a person's immigration status, their citizenship, address, employment information, personal and financial data, health insurance information, and electronic version of their fingerprints that meet DHS standards. If they do not comply they do not get reimbursed. This means hospital personnel will have to spend time collecting information as opposed to treating the sick. More importantly, this places the burden on doctors to choose between treating a person and looking out for the financial security of the hospital. This is not a choice that a doctor should be forced to make.

Many businesses do their due diligence in determining and screening workers but they do not have all the resources to fully verify immigration status. This legislation forces those businesses to reimburse hospitals for care if the company unknowingly employs a worker without full immigration documentation or offer health insurance to all of their workers. We should not punish businesses that have tried and do not have the resources to verify the immigration status of their workers. We also cannot require businesses to provide health insurance. That is a business decision and should be left to them. Government should not be forcing the hand of business.

This legislation is opposed by the American Hospital Association, the American Medical Association, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association for Manufacturing because this legislation does not address the real issue.

This legislation penalizes hospitals and businesses and is not a way to stop illegal immigration. This is a law enforcement problem not a medical problem. We need to step up our efforts to reduce illegal immigration by increasing our resources in the law enforcement community.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3722.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of

those present have voted in the affirmative.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

CONDEMNING GOVERNMENT OF REPUBLIC OF SUDAN FOR ATTACKS AGAINST INNOCENT CIVILIANS IN IMPOVERISHED DARFUR REGION

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 403) condemning the Government of the Republic of the Sudan for its attacks against innocent civilians in the impoverished Darfur region of western Sudan, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 403

Whereas, since early 2003, a conflict between forces of the Government of the Republic of the Sudan, including militia forces backed by the Government, and rebel forces in the impoverished Darfur region of western Sudan has resulted in attacks by ground and air forces of the Government of Sudan against innocent civilians and undefended villages in the region;

Whereas Sudanese Government forces and government supported militia forces have also engaged in the use of rape as a weapon of war, the abduction of children, the destruction of food and water sources, and the deliberate and systematic manipulation and denial of humanitarian assistance for the people of the Darfur region;

Whereas, on December 18, 2003, United Nations Undersecretary General for Humanitarian Affairs Jan Egeland declared that the Darfur region was probably "the world's worst humanitarian catastrophe", and in April 2004 reported to the United Nations Security Council that in Darfur, "a sequence of deliberate actions has been observed that seem aimed at achieving a specific objective: the forcible and long-term displacement of the targeted communities which may also be termed 'ethnic cleansing'";

Whereas, on February 17, 2004, Amnesty International reported that it "continues to receive details of horrifying attacks against civilians in villages by government warplanes, soldiers, and pro-government militia";

Whereas, on February 18, 2004, United Nations Special Envoy for Humanitarian Affairs in Sudan Tom Eric Vraalsen declared, following a trip to the Darfur region, that "aid workers are unable to reach the vast majority [of the displaced]";

Whereas Doctors Without Borders, the Nobel Peace Prize-winning medical humanitarian relief organization and one of the few aid groups on the ground in the Darfur region, reported that the region is the scene of "catastrophic mortality rates";

Whereas, on April 20, the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human

Rights delayed the release of a report citing gross human rights abuses, crimes against humanity, and war crimes committed in Darfur in a bid to gain access to Sudan for investigators;

Whereas the Government of Sudan continues to deny humanitarian assistance for the people of the Darfur region by denying them unrestricted access to humanitarian aid organizations;

Whereas attacks on civilians in Darfur continue despite an April 8, 2004, temporary cease-fire agreement;

Whereas nearly 3,000,000 people affected by the conflict in the Darfur region have remained beyond the reach of aid agencies trying to provide essential humanitarian assistance, and United Nations aid agencies estimate that they have been able to reach only 15 percent of people in need and that more than 700,000 people have been displaced within Sudan in the past year; and

Whereas the United States delegation to the 60th Session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights sponsored a resolution condemning the Government of Sudan for grave violations of human rights and humanitarian law occurring in the Darfur region: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—

(1) strongly condemns the Government of the Republic of the Sudan and militia groups supported by the Government of Sudan for attacks against innocent civilians in the impoverished Darfur region of western Sudan, in violation of Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions, done at Geneva August 12, 1949, and entered into force October 21, 1950, which specifically prohibit attacks on civilians, and demands that the Government of Sudan immediately take actions to cease these attacks;

(2) urges the Government of Sudan to immediately disarm and disband government supported militia groups;

(3) urges the Government of Sudan and all parties to honor commitments made in the cease-fire agreement of April 8, 2004;

(4) calls on the Government of Sudan to grant full, unconditional, and immediate access to Darfur to humanitarian aid organizations, the human rights investigation and humanitarian teams of the United Nations, including protection officers, and an international monitoring team in compliance with the temporary cease-fire agreement that is based in Darfur and has the support of the United States and the European Union;

(5) encourages the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to work with donors to immediately deliver humanitarian assistance to Darfur, including the delivery of food by air if necessary;

(6) calls on the Secretary of State to develop a plan for further bilateral and multilateral action in the event the Government of Sudan fails to immediately undertake the actions called for in paragraph (3), including a plan to seek a Security Council resolution addressing the Darfur situation;

(7) deplores the inaction of some member states of the United Nations and the failure of the United Nations Human Rights Commission to take strong action with respect to the crisis in Darfur;

(8) urges the President to direct the United States Representative to the United Nations to—

(A) seek an official investigation by the United Nations to determine if crimes against humanity have been committed by the Government of Sudan and government-supported militia groups in the Darfur region; and

(B) work with the international community to ensure that the individuals responsible for crimes against humanity in Darfur are held accountable for their actions; and

(9) strongly urges the President to impose targeted sanctions, including a ban on travel to the United States and freezing of personal assets, against officials and other individuals of the Government of Sudan, as well as Janjaweed militia commanders, who are responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity in the Darfur region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 403, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for bringing House Concurrent Resolution 403, condemning the Government of Sudan for its attacks against innocent civilians in the impoverished Darfur region of western Sudan, before us today.

The crisis in Darfur has been described as one of the worst humanitarian catastrophes on the planet. Nearly 1 million people have been displaced, and anywhere between 10,000 and 30,000 people have been killed. The United States Agency for International Development estimates that another 350,000 civilians could die in the next 9 months as a result of the unfolding humanitarian crisis.

Backed by the Sudanese Government, Arabic-speaking militias, collectively known as the Janjaweed, have murdered, raped and pillaged with impunity. Hundreds of villages have been burned to the ground, crops have been razed and vital irrigation systems have been destroyed.

It is feared that the situation will only get worse. The rainy season has now arrived, making transport of food aid more difficult and more costly. If the refugees cannot return to their homes to plant crops soon, they will be completely dependent on food aid for the next 18 months. Outrageously, the Sudanese Government continues to frustrate efforts to deliver humanitarian assistance to the region.

Following a Security Council briefing earlier this month, the acting U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights summarized the situation in Darfur by stating: "One, there is a reign of terror in this area. Two, there is a scorched earth policy. Three, there are repeated

war crimes and crimes against humanity. And four, this is taking place before our very eyes."

Despite these facts and despite the best efforts by the administration, Sudan was given nothing more than a half-hearted slap on the wrist during the recently concluded 60th session of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

Adding insult to injury, Sudan was then reelected to serve on the Commission for another 2 years. The irony of the election of Sudan, one of the worst violators of human rights on the planet, to serve on the U.N. Commission for Human Rights, that irony should not be lost on anyone.

House Concurrent Resolution 403 strongly condemns the attack against innocent civilians by the Government of Sudan and government-supported militia groups. The resolution calls on the Government of Sudan to grant full and unconditional humanitarian access to the region and urges the government to disarm and disband the Janjaweed forces.

H. Con. Res. 403 recognizes the efforts of the United States delegation to the 60th session of the U.N. Human Rights Commission to address the crisis in Darfur, and deplores the inaction of other members.

The resolution also urges the United States Government to take specific steps to aid the refugees and to hold accountable those in the Government of Sudan who are responsible for these atrocities. Included among those recommended measures are an asset freeze and a travel ban for those who are responsible for what the administration and the U.N. have described as "ethnic cleansing."

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Conscience of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum has issued a "Genocide Alert" for Darfur. This crisis is the direct result of actions taken by the Government of Sudan. It is incumbent upon the Congress to condemn these actions and to urge the administration to take steps to aid the victims and punish those responsible for the atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan resolution which has been given full consideration during a hearing and markup by the Committee on International Relations on May 6 of this year, and I urge Members' support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I first would like to commend my good friend and cochairman of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), for introducing this critically important legislation. We are all deeply indebted to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for speaking out for human rights in Sudan and, in fact, for human rights around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, just 2 weeks ago, we solemnly remembered the 10th anniversary of the Rwanda genocide, where the world stood by and allowed the slaughter of 1 million innocent people in 100 days. In the aftermath of that horror, the international community again pledged never again to stand by and allow an atrocity to emerge without taking preventive action.

Yet, as we speak, the Sudanese Government has mobilized its military forces and Arab militias, called the Janjaweed, to carry out a scorched earth policy of indiscriminate killing and the removal of non-Arab African civilians from their homes in Darfur in western Sudan. Both USAID and the United Nations have described these atrocities as ethnic cleansing, and the Committee on Conscience of our own Holocaust Memorial Museum has issued a genocide warning for Darfur.

Mr. Speaker, Khartoum and its brutal militias are systematically torturing, raping and killing thousands of innocent civilians, based solely on their identity. The Janjaweed, the Arab terrorists, have looted and burned villages and depopulated entire areas with impunity, in direct violation of international law.

We estimate that as many as 30,000 civilians may have been slaughtered and over 1 million driven off their land into unprotected camps for the internally displaced and refugee camps across the border in Chad. If we allow Khartoum to continue this mayhem, probably over 100,000 will die by the end of the year.

We cannot allow this to happen. Khartoum must be stopped. I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the only thing Bashir and his cronies understand and respond to is strength and the resolve of the international community, led by our own government.

Bashir and those responsible in his government, including his vice president, Ali Taha, are masters at manipulating the international community by holding hostage the prospects of humanitarian access in Darfur and the peace process in Kenya, while conducting a vicious campaign of terror against innocent civilians.

Khartoum has even treated with contempt our own government's efforts to bring humanitarian relief to the suffering people in Darfur by delaying visas to American disaster workers. Cynically and arrogantly, Khartoum stalls while innocent men, women and children suffer.

Mr. Speaker, in response to widespread global criticism, Bashir now has issued a presidential decree appointing a committee to investigate the egregious human rights violations carried out in Darfur by his own government and their Arab allies.

First, Khartoum deliberately designed a strategy to drive thousands of black Africans from their homes. In the process, Arab militias were directed to commit unspeakably horrible acts. Then, when the international

community expresses outrage, the government that committed the crimes appoints a committee to investigate itself.

I find it ludicrous and absurd for us to continue to play along with Khartoum's game and to accept this blatant attempt to disavow knowledge of well-documented atrocities that Bashir and his people directed their armed forces and the Arab militias to commit.

Mr. Speaker, as we debate this resolution, Arab terrorists of the Janjaweed are killing men, kidnapping children, raping women and burning villages.

□ 1600

There must be an urgency about our work in addressing this crisis; and Darfur, therefore, must assume the highest priority.

I challenge President Bush's Secretary of State Colin Powell and Kofi Anan, the Secretary General of the United Nations, to exercise their leadership and to stop this nightmare from continuing. I also challenge the European Union and the African Union. Appallingly, African nations recently ensured Sudan a seat on the U.N. Human Rights Commission in spite of its attack on the people of Darfur, motivated exclusively by sickening racism.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon President Bush to withhold any normalization of relations with the Sudan. We must demand of Khartoum an immediate cessation of violence in Darfur and the disarming of Arab terrorists according to the cease fire agreement they signed. Khartoum must allow protective units and humanitarian agencies full and immediate access to Darfur.

Khartoum also must address the legitimate grievances of those living under the tyranny of this regime. The United Nations Human Rights Commission must convene immediately on this crisis to shed light on the atrocities and to galvanize international support for the victims of Darfur.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we must do what is necessary to end this conflict in Sudan and to bring security to the long suffering people of Darfur. If Khartoum continues its intransigence, the President should consider target sanctions against those responsible for these atrocities and undertake extraordinary measures to get food, medicine, clothing, and shelter to those in desperate need. Our credibility and our reputation as a humane Nation depend on this. We do not have the luxury of failure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, who is a strong voice on this subject.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

I would like to begin by seconding the remarks by the ranking member of

the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS). I believe, as he does, that the killing in western Sudan demands the world's attention. This resolution of which we are co-sponsors condemns Sudan's government for attacks against civilians in the Darfur region. As explained, the numbers here are very grim. Because the government's Scorched Earth policies have killed tens of thousands of people, have displaced as of today over one million human beings, many of them forced into neighboring Chad, hundreds of villages have been burned to the ground, those irrigation systems have been destroyed, and government-backed militias have committed widespread rapes; but beyond that, beyond that the victims of these rapes are often branded on the forehead, which is a rather unique proof of the intent of ethnic cleansing that is going on in these communities.

Denied access to this region by the government, I think we can only imagine the full extent of this relentless campaign which has the look of genocide against the people of Darfur. I believe the administration deserves credit for its sustained commitment to bringing peace to Sudan. Congress has backed its effort, including the Sudan Peace Act. The Subcommittee on Africa, which I chair, has closely followed negotiations between Khartoum and the SPLM.

But after several years, it is less and less likely that those negotiations will succeed. The administration's Sudan Peace Act, the report on that peace act of last month noted that, the bottom line, these talks had become stagnant. We need to keep in mind too that any agreement reached would face major challenges being implemented. Africa has seen many failed peace agreements. So Khartoum's true colors, I am afraid, are being shown in Darfur. At this point, for my part I would have little faith in any peace agreements it signs.

If we remain engaged in this peace process, though, Darfur must not be discounted. Darfur must be addressed. Last month, the Subcommittee on Africa held a hearing looking back on the Rwandan genocide. During the run-up to the killing of a million people, the United States and others were dulled to its warning signs because of the commitment to a doomed peace process. And I am afraid that that may be part of what we are witnessing here.

In Rwanda, like in Sudan today, the government denied its support for militias carrying out ethnic cleansing. It was very familiar to these, very close akin to this same circumstance we face here. Khartoum should know that peace agreement or not, there will be no normal relations with the United States as long as it is committing atrocities in Darfur. The administration brought Darfur to the world's attention at the United Nations Commission on Human Rights' annual session

in Geneva. That its proposal to censure the Sudanese Government was widely rejected is yet more evidence that the commission is a very troubled institution. It also makes it harder to believe that other countries have much of a commitment to peace in Sudan.

Moving ahead, our assumption on Sudan that the international community will provide material support and be an honest broker if a peace agreement is signed should be rethought. I support this resolution; I urge its passage. And I would also like to commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his dedication to this issue.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), my good friend and our distinguished colleague.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations for yielding me time and also for his strong and eloquent statement in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 403. This bill sounds the alarm once again on genocide in Sudan. Since 1983, more than 2 million black civilians died during the civil war in the south of Sudan. That struggle was especially brutal for the civilian population: slave raids resulting in the enslavement of women and children, gang rape, ethnic cleansing, and the imposition of famine conditions for hundreds of thousands.

The people of Sudan are facing the same catastrophic situation once again. Since early 2003, conflict between the forces of the government of the Republic of Sudan and rebel forces in the impoverished Darfur region of western Sudan has resulted in attacks by Sudanese Government ground and air forces against innocent civilians and undefended villages in the region. This has led to the Sudanese Government forces engaging in the use of rape as a weapon of war, the abduction of children, the destruction of food and water sources, and the deliberate and systematic manipulation and denial of humanitarian assistance for the people of the Darfur region.

The United Nations and other aid agencies trying to provide essential humanitarian assistance have been able to reach only 15 percent of the people in need, denying nearly 3 million people in need. More than 100,000 Sudanese have fled the region and are now refugees in neighboring Chad.

These acts are clear violations of the Genocide Convention and are grave crimes against humanity. We cannot sit back and do nothing. We must speak out and act against these actions. We cannot afford to repeat the mistakes of the genocide in Rwanda where more than 800,000 Rwandans died while we along with the world watched and did little or nothing.

Mr. Speaker, we need to act now. The more time wasted by doing nothing, the more Sudanese people in the Darfur region will suffer, die, and be displaced from their homes.

I commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for introducing this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as others have noted, we recently marked the anniversary of a terrible chapter in world history, the Rwandan genocide. The fact that we are here today speaking on Sudan really calls into question whether or not we have learned anything at all, whether the world has learned anything at all. These atrocities of which we speak are occurring now, before our eyes. There is no question; there is no doubt. We are all on notice. It was terrible enough that we did little then through the days of the Rwandan genocide. It will be all the worse if the world fails to act now.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution that is before us today on the suspension calendar concerning the current crisis in Sudan, South Africa. Our colleagues, Mr. WOLF and Mr. PAYNE, are to be commended for their leadership and efforts in drafting H. Con. Res. 403 and for their advocacy on the issues. Just as we have recently seen in Liberia and Haiti, we see in the Darfur region of Sudan—humanitarian priorities are being subordinated to political agendas.

What is most saddening and what inspires the most fear is the fact that this region is inflicting vulnerability upon itself in the wake of international terrorism. But then again, who needs a terrorist attack when your government is forcibly displacing and starving millions of its own civilians in the course of making political statements?

This situation has been described as "the worst humanitarian crisis in the world today" given the over one million people displaced since the fighting intensified in early 2003. I will cite the insightful words of my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE when he addressed the House last Thursday on this issue:

Mr. Speaker, it is important for us to remember that in 1994 the international community watched with utter indifference when 1 million Rwandans were hacked to death in 100 days. The genocide in Darfur occurred while the international community was commemorating the 10th anniversary of the Rwandan genocide. We failed to learn from Rwanda, and we are likely to learn from Darfur. The similarities between the Rwandan genocide and Darfur are stunning. In Rwanda the former government of Rwanda and the Rwandan Patriotic Front rebels were negotiating while plans for genocide were underway.

The important thing to recognize in the words of this gentleman are that the "international community watched with utter indifference." H. Con. Res. 403 is but a beginning and a first step to the extent to which this nation and the nations of the international community must intervene in order to end the death, displacement, rape, and suffering.

Reuters, in an article dated April 19, 2004 noted that "international engagement with the

crisis has been slow and ineffective" and that "Western governments have appeared reluctant to press the Sudanese government to fulfill its obligations" to international law, the principle of democracy, and to its own people.

Over 700,000 people have had to flee to urban centers in Darfur and there has been further displacement to various parts of Sudan, including Khartoum. Moreover, an additional 135,000 refugees have moved to Chad. Thousands of innocent civilians have died due to the violence, and many more are dying and will die due to conflict-related diseases. This situation is exacerbated when the government openly restricts relief efforts and when it allows supplies to be looted after distribution.

With respect to international law, the parties to this internal armed conflict have violated Common Article 3 of the 1949 Geneva Convention which prohibits attacks on civilians. The government of Sudan is bound by its own laws and international law to prosecute any party to the conflict guilty of committing abuses. Moreover, the government is responsible for proxy forces under its control.

The United States and members of the international community must intervene and at the very least, inflict pressure upon the Sudanese government to mitigate the violations of law. Allegations have been described as: ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity, and genocide. In the case of armed conflict relative to international law, Sudan has failed in the following areas:

Distinction—the duty to distinguish between military and civilian targets;

Precaution—the duty to minimize incidental injury to civilians and damage to civilian property; and

Proportionality—any injury or damage must be proportionate to the concrete and direct military advantage anticipated.

Furthermore, Common Article 3 of the 1949 Geneva Convention squarely apply to this situation. Under the provisions of Article 3, basic civilian safeguards in civil conflicts must be provided.

Non-derogable provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 1966 apply, i.e., the right to life.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 403 articulates the fact that we recognize the wrongdoings that have been perpetrated by the Sudanese government. Our next step must be to commit to acting to and garnering support to applying pressure on the parties in the conflict to respect humanitarian and human rights law. They must be compelled, under rule of law, to protect civilians and to allow humanitarian aid to flow to those who are in dire need. This chaotic situation and lawlessness must end at once. I support this legislation, urge my colleagues to join me in so supporting, and move this Administration to take the next step in working to stop the violence and installing peace and the rule of law.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 403. As one of the architects of the Sudan Peace Act signed by President Bush in October 2002, I am completely dismayed at the continuation and the possible repeat of another civil war in Sudan. Previously, countless Christians have been killed or starved to death simply because of their ethnicity and religious beliefs. Now in Darfur in the West, an area roughly the size of France, unlike the situation in the South, this is not Chris-

tian versus Muslims. It is genocide of black Africans by the Arabic government and Jangaweed (nomadic Arab tribesmen).

Today, the current humanitarian crisis in Sudan is considered one of the worst in decades. According to the World Food Program (WFP), the Sudanese, "are facing serious food and water shortages due to the combined disruptions of civil war and drought." In the West, hundreds of thousands of malnourished villagers, having been burned out of their homes in a systematic campaign of terror, are starving to death.

Foreign correspondents from major newspapers have reported at least 700,000 Darfur residents are living in camps or have fled to villages to stay with families or friends. Women, girls, students, and teachers are systematically beaten and gang-raped. One villager, as quoted this week in a London newspaper, gave this simple explanation, "We got harassed on a daily basis by people in uniform." Furthermore he said, "they (Jangaweed) used to be herders, we know who they are, but the government had guns and uniforms and told them to hurt the blacks." Despite millions of dollars of humanitarian aid from the United States, the Sudanese, particularly the black Africans in Darfur, continue to suffer.

The conflict between the government of Khartoum/Jangaweed and the black Africans in Darfur must be stopped. While I am pleased with the announcement that the State Department will be sending American aid experts to inspect the humanitarian needs, what we really need to be done is for the Administration to stop this genocide and begin negotiations as soon as possible to end this long-standing humanitarian crisis.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I commend the House, Chairman HYDE and International Relations Committee for bringing H. Con. Res. 403 to the floor quickly and I urge a unanimous vote for this important resolution.

The conflict in Sudan began early last year when the Government of Sudan began arming the Janjaweed militia to suppress local rebel groups. The Janjaweed, with the support of government troops began their reign of terror on the people of Darfur.

The result—ethnic cleansing and the death of thousands of innocent civilians. One million people are now displaced. Village after village attacked, looted and burned. The survivors bear scars of mutilation and rape. Schools filled with students have been attacked and the girls raped.

Thousands of survivors walk days, weeks and sometimes months in the unrelenting sun to seek safety in Chad. They are pursued by Janjaweed and often bombed as they languish on the border.

Hundreds of thousands of civilians are trapped in camps inside Darfur. Surrounded by militia and unable to leave to seek water or firewood. Families are forced to make life or death decisions on which family member will go to gather food and risk certain death.

People are living on top of each other in crowded camps. Disease and malnutrition are rampant. USAID now estimates that by fall the world will see catastrophic mortality rates from disease and starvation.

The world has finally found its voice as reports are trickling out describing the reality of Darfur. The headlines in major U.S. newspapers have read like a horror film:

"Sudan militiamen on horses uproot a million";

"Sudan's hellish humanitarian crisis";

"Sudan's Darfur is calm because there are no more villages to burn".

"Sudan starving Darfur refugees"

I would like to read an excerpt from the May 15 Economist:

Her story is typical. . . . An air raid caught her unawares: as bombs fell, she ran around in confusion. When the bombers had completed their return pass, the horizon filled with dust, the ground shuddered, and a host of mounted militiamen charged through the village, killing all the young men they could find . . . her 18-month baby . . . killed by shrapnel.

Two weeks later her oldest son, 15, was made to kneel in line with other young men before being shot in the back of the head. Her husband disappeared the same day.

But words are not enough. The international community has been reluctant to act.

Secretary General Kofi Annan should go to Darfur and stand with the persecuted.

I introduced this resolution so Members of Congress would have the opportunity to voice their support for the innocent people in Darfur.

This resolution strongly condemns the Government of Sudan and government-supported militia groups for attacks against innocent civilians, in violation of the Geneva Convention.

The Government of Sudan should immediately disarm the militia, and allow full unconditional humanitarian access to Darfur. The civilians who are languishing in camps should be provided immediate protection.

Why is the world slow to respond when atrocities are taking place before our eyes?

The world has said never again and over and over again, yet when it is put to the test and charged with protecting humanity it continues to fail.

Why has the international community become content with the slaughter of innocent human beings?

When will the death of innocent human beings be too much for the world to bear?

We need to be bold and willing to condemn and shame countries that commit atrocities against their own citizens.

It is our moral responsibility to protect humanity and not sit idly by in the face of horror. Those of us in public office have the unique responsibility and the power of our voices to confront evil.

The world is a safer place when the world sides with the opposed.

Today, let our voices be raised for the innocent people of Darfur.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the full Economist story. I urge every Member to read the graphic detail of Khartoums destruction of innocent lives.

[From the Economist, May 15, 2004]

FLEEING THE HORSEMEN WHO KILL FOR
KHARTOUM

Her children's bodies were rotting in the village wells, where Arab militiamen had thrown them to poison the water supply. But Kaltuma Hasala Adan did not flee her home. Leaving her crops and livestock would condemn the rest of the family to death, she reasoned. So she stayed put for four months, despite her government's strenuous efforts to terrorize her into flight.

Her story is typical of western Sudan's black Africans. Her village was first attacked in January. An air raid caught her unawares: as the bombs fell, she ran around

in confusion. When the bombers had completed their return pass, the horizon filled with dust, the ground shuddered, and a host of mounted militiamen charged through the village, killing all the young men they could find. During that first attack, Kaltuma's 18-month baby, Ali, was killed by shrapnel. Two weeks later, her oldest son, Issa, 15, was made to kneel in line with other young men before being shot in the back of the head. Her husband disappeared the same day.

For four wretched months, Kaltuma lived with both ears strained for the faint drone of bombers, poised to dash with her three surviving children to a hiding place in a dry river bed. Then the janjaweed—an Arab militia that kills for the Sudanese government—rode up to finish the job. They razed her village entirely. She fled from the embers of her hut and trekked for four days through the desert. Across the border in Chad, she found sanctuary in the town of Tiné. Thousands of her neighbours were already there when she arrived.

The UN's humanitarian co-ordinator for Sudan, Mukesh Kapila, described what is going on in Darfur, an arid region of western Sudan, as "the worst humanitarian crisis in the world". Human Rights Watch, a lobby group, has accused Sudan's Arab-dominated government of crimes against humanity. The government is seeking to purge Darfur of black Africans, using methods as cruel as they are effective. Perhaps a million people have fled their homes. Officials deny ethnic cleansing, of course, but the refugees say they lie.

As Kaltuma tells her story, a crowd gathers to corroborate it. Osman Nurrudin Sadr says his whole family was killed. Khadija Yacob Abdallah, a pretty 17-year-old, watched her parents die and was then gang-raped. All the refugees offer the same explanation. "They want to kill us because we are black," says one.

It is a little more complicated than that. Sudan, Africa's largest country, is the scene of two separate but related civil wars. One, between the north and south, pits the Arab, Islamist government against rebels who are mostly black African and non-Muslim. This war has been raging intermittently for half a century, but has come tantalizingly close to resolution in the past year: partly because of foreign pressure, especially from America, and partly because both sides, exhausted, wish to stop fighting and share Sudan's newfound oil wealth.

The other war, between the government and two rebel groups in Darfur, pits Muslim against Muslim. The divide in Darfur is ethnic, between Arabs and black Africans. This war flared up only last year. It was seen at first as a mere sideshow, but is now too vast and vile to be ignored.

CENTURIES OF SUFFERING

The south has been marginalized for centuries. Arab slavers used it as a hunting-ground for human booty, despite Anglo-Egyptian attempts to crush the trade in the 19th century. When independence came in 1956, southerners demanded autonomy. They were ignored, so they rebelled.

The war paused between 1972 and 1983, but then resumed. The government used scorched-earth tactics against the main rebel group, the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA), bombing villages suspected of rebel sympathies, and arming and encouraging militias to kill and pillage in rebel-held areas. Slave raids continued, checked only by the absence of tarmac roads in the south.

Largely because it involved Muslims enslaving Christians, the war gripped the imagination of America's influential Christian lobby. In fact, only a minority of south-

ern Sudanese are Christians; the rest are cheerfully polytheistic or animist. Nonetheless, America took an interest, which increased when the radical Islamist regime in Khartoum hosted Osama bin Laden in the early 1990s. In retaliation for al-Qaeda's attacks on American embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998, President Bill Clinton bombed a Sudanese factory he said was producing nerve gas, but which may have been making aspirin. The regime was already distancing itself from its international terrorist associates, a process swiftly accelerated by the American invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq.

Sudan's rulers rounded up terrorist suspects, shared intelligence and froze Mr. bin Laden's assets in Sudan, including a cannabis farm worked by child slaves who had apparently been brought from a Ugandan rebel group for one Kalashnikov each.

At the same time, the Sudanese government started to yield to American pressure to seek peace with the south. Negotiations have been tortuous, but Vice-President Ali Osman Taha keeps talking to John Garang, the SPLA leader. If the government shows bad faith, America threatens to choke it with sanctions and to bankroll the SPLA.

Since 2001 the two sides have hammered out a series of agreements that are supposed to culminate in a comprehensive peace. Last September they signed a security accord, mapping out how Khartoum will withdraw most of its troops from the south. This year has seen a written agreement on how to split the revenues from the oil that lies under Sudanese sand, and verbal agreements on power-sharing and the future of three contested areas. Some of these are on the northern side of the line (see map), but their inhabitants consider themselves southern.

For an interim period of six years, Sudan is to remain one country, with Omar al-Bashir, the current president, remaining in office, and with Mr. Garang, the rebel leader, as his deputy. Then there is to be a referendum in which southerners will be offered the choice of staying or seceding.

THE WEST BURNS

The trouble with this plan for a new Sudan is that it involves only the two main belligerents. Peaceful opposition groups have been left out. Since neither the government nor the SPLA is remotely democratic, many Sudanese seethe at the prospect of them divvying up the petrodollars. In Darfur, that rage has sparked mayhem.

Darfur has seen sporadic fighting for generations. As the desert has expanded, camel- and cattle-herding Arab nomads have bickered with black African farmers over dwindling supplies of water and pasture. Darfur's black tribes complain that, since the 1980s, they have been pushed out of government jobs in favor of Arabs. And the region has been flooded with weapons. Khartoum first armed the janjaweed so they could ride south and pillage SPLA territory. Arms from a long-running conflict between Chad and Libya seeped across the border into Darfur.

Last year, a new rebel group, the Sudan Liberation Army (SLA) appeared in Darfur and won a string of victories. Soon after, a second group sprang up, the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM). The government in Khartoum felt vulnerable. It was terrified that rebel successes in Darfur might inspire other marginalised groups in the north and east, especially since the SLA has links with a rebel group in the east.

The government struck back, not only against the rebels, but also against their ethnic kin. It unleashed the janjaweed. To swell the militia's ranks, Arab criminals were released from jail and given horses, \$100 each and carte blanche to loot. (These ex-pris-

oners are labeled ta'ibeen, "those who have repented".)

The janjaweed have clattered into village after African village, torching the straw roofs of conical huts, killing young men who might join the rebels, raping women who might feed them, and stealing everything they can carry off. Sometimes they brand the hands of the women they rape, to make the stigma permanent. They have also torched dozens of mosques and torn up and defecated on copies of the Koran. Whatever inspires them, it is not Islam.

Their victims have no doubt that the janjaweed enjoy the state's blessing. When asked what gives them the right to stop blacks at road blocks, the militiamen reply: "We are the government." When pillaging, they are often supported by the air force and by the regular army. "First the planes come, then the janjaweed and finally government soldiers," says a refugee. "They are brothers united on a mission to kill."

It was a long time before the outside world took notice. At first, both America and the UN hesitated to make a fuss about Darfur for fear of derailing the north-south peace process. But in March, the UN's man on the spot started making comparisons with the Rwandan genocide of 1994. That was an exaggeration, but it prompted Washington to lean on Khartoum to end the ethnic cleansing. A ceasefire followed on April 8th, supposedly to help aid workers do their job, but was quickly broken.

Fighting and pillage continue, making it hard to feed the displaced. The UN does not want to get too close to the border—the janjaweed do not respect international boundaries—so it has moved 35,000 refugees deep into Chad. Tens of thousands remain stranded near the border. Those unfortunate enough to wind up in camps in Darfur have been deliberately starved by the janjaweed, according to the UN.

Brave charities such as Médecins Sans Frontières have ignored the occasional air raid to dole out medical supplies, feed the hungriest and vaccinate against a meningitis outbreak. Most refugees in Chad have depended on food and water from the locals who, though poor, are startlingly generous. Supplies are running out, however, and the UN mission is short of cash.

The rainy season is almost here, when the valleys will fill with water and it will be impossible to get the refugees into the half-empty camps that await them. UN lorries lie stranded because there is no money for fuel and the drivers, unpaid for six weeks, have gone on strike.

Over 10,000 newly arrived refugees around Bahai, north of Tiné, have been dismissed as "combatants"—though most are women, children or old men. For the UN, admitting that they are refugees would mean being obligated to look after them. "I'm trying to think of something the UN has done right here, but I'm struggling," says one aid worker with a sigh.

SPEARS AND PLOUGHSHARES

There is more to cheer about in southern Sudan. After years of enduring the same abuses now being lavished on Darfur, the south is relatively calm. In Rumbek, the largest town under SPLA control, where abandoned armoured cars rust outside buildings gutted by shelling, hardly any shrapnel has flown for two years.

Half-forgotten tribal traditions are being rediscovered. On a dusty football pitch known as Freedom Square, thousands of young Dinka men, coated with ash and clad in glamorous calfskin skirts, gather to elect a sub-chief. Not long ago such affairs were subdued, forced indoors by the fear of aerial bombardment. Now they are gleefully raucous.

War has left the south shattered. Most of the young warriors queuing behind their chosen candidates have known nothing else. There is no electricity or running water in the south, an area the size of France and Germany combined, and precious few schools, either. Southern children used to join either the rebels or government-backed militias. They grew up knowing how to march long distances on empty stomachs, but not how to read.

Peace, if it lasts, will offer southerners a chance to grow less poor. In one village, your correspondent saw a group of SPLA soldiers melting bullets to fashion spearheads for hunting gazelles. The same men were baffled, however, by a consignment of ploughshares, kindly donated by a western aid agency. Unsure what these strange objects were for, they beat them down to make stools.

Elsewhere, workers can be seen hacking through thorny scrub. They are clearing a path for a road, heading for a large rock in the wilderness known as Ramciel, or "the place where the rhinos meet". More accurately, it should be "where rhinos used to meet", as they were poached out of existence some time ago. It is here that the SPLA is thinking of building the south's principal city. Charles Deng, the assistant foreman, has big dreams for the place. "First we will finish the road," he says. "Then we will build skyscrapers and ponds, better than London or maybe even as good as Nairobi."

Not everyone welcomes progress. An SPLA commander in nearby Yirol murmured into his beer that he hoped the capital would be built elsewhere. "If they build it here then they will also build schools and our girls will be sent to those schools," he said. "You know what the means? Their bride price will fall. My daughters will be worthless to me."

THE END OF THE WAR, OR OF SUDAN?

A formal deal ending the war is expected in the next few weeks, possibly sooner. Since President George Bush is widely seen as the architect of peace, he is perhaps more popular in southern Sudan than anywhere else on earth. At the Rumbek sub-chief's election one young warrior called Thuapon leaps frenetically in the air, proudly waving a white Barbie-doll in a pink dress. "This is a new wife for President Bush. May God grant him many fertile women with firm bodies and an election victory without problems in Florida."

The main outstanding issue concerns the religious status of Khartoum. The government wants it to remain under sharia (Islamic law); the SPLA does not. Some fudge is surely possible. Observers are confident that a deal will be signed. "If Khartoum were to renege at this point, it would signal that this whole process was a charade from the beginning," says John Prendergast of the International Crisis Group, a campaigning think-tank.

The difficulty will lie in how the deal is implemented. Unsurprisingly, southerners do not trust the government. "They just want time to re-arm," says James Thuadong, an aspiring teacher in Rumbek. "We know this is just a peace of one or two years. They will never let us become independent." Mr. Thuadong could well be right. There is no provision yet for what will happen to revenues from Sudan's oilfields, which lie mostly in the south, should voters choose secession.

The two sides are unwilling to discuss this issue, but Khartoum would presumably never let the south go if that meant losing the petrodollars, too. "When preparations begin for the independence referendum, we are going to see major meddling by elements in Khartoum, aimed at creating chaos in the south and delaying [the] plebiscite," predicts Mr. Prendergast.

Another worry is that southerners are squabblesome. During the war, they spent as much time fighting each other as the government. Mr. Garang may still be the south's key leader, but his support for a united Sudan will irk secessionists, who are probably a majority in the south. Other ethnic groups resent the politically dominant Dinka people, and even the Dinka are divided.

Once a peace deal is signed, many of the 4m southerners living in squatter camps around the main cities of the north will probably decide to pick their way through minefields and make the long journey home. Tension over scarce natural resources seems likely. As if to confound the optimists, there has been a serious outbreak of fighting in the ancient Shilluk kingdom since March. At least 70,000 people have been driven from their homes after battles between militias loyal to Khartoum and the SPLA. As usual in Sudan, most of the casualties were civilians.

MANY VOICES, MANY FEARS

In Khartoum, the mood is apprehensive. The political elite is genuinely alarmed at what capitulation to southern demands might encourage. Says Ghazi Attabani, a former presidential adviser: "If the south were to secede, it would be catastrophic both for Sudan and for Africa. Secession would not be peaceful. Internal differences in the south would cause rifts which would make Rwanda seem like a picnic."

Because of stringent censorship and the physical difficulty of visiting Sudan's more troubled areas, ordinary northerners have only a rough idea of what is going on in their own country. Some are optimistic. "Of course the people can live together," says Ahmed Omar Othman, a shopkeeper. "Just look around Khartoum, we do already. Here, you will find a church next to a mosque—surely that [proves it]? The real problem is whether the politicians can work together."

The record of Sudanese politicians in this area is not good. Their preferred technique for holding this huge and multifarious country together—barbaric force—has been shown not to work. In Darfur, as Mr. Attabani admits, "There is no military solution." Arming gangsters such as the Janjaweed is easy; reining them in again may prove much harder. Says Sharif Harir, chief negotiator for the SLA rebels: "Even if Khartoum had the will to stop them, it probably doesn't have the power."

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 403.

Sudan, geographically the largest country in Africa, has been ravaged by civil war for four decades. An estimated two million people have died over the past two decades due to war-related causes and famine, and millions have been displaced from their homes. According to the United Nations, an estimated three million people are in need of emergency food aid. Recently, violence has escalated in the Darfur region of the Western Sudan, where government-sponsored militias have been ruthlessly targeting various ethnic groups. Approximately one million civilians have been forced to flee their homes and are now either internally displaced or seeking refuge in neighboring Chad.

Sudanese government forces have overseen and directly participated in massacres, summary executions of civilians, burning of towns and villages, and the forcible depopulation of wide swathes of land long inhabited by the Fur, Masalit and Zaghawa ethnic groups.

For months, the Sudanese government has restricted international media access to Darfur

and has limited reporting about the conflict in the national press. Recently, the government has allowed minimal access to the region for international humanitarian agencies but has still failed to provide the necessary protection and assistance to prevent a full-blown humanitarian crisis.

There can be no doubt about the Sudanese government's culpability in crimes against humanity in Darfur. With this resolution, Congress demands that the Sudanese government take immediate steps to reverse ethnic cleansing in Darfur before the situation there worsens and engulfs the entire region in conflict.

The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. WOLF, should be commended for keeping the events in Sudan on Congress' agenda and I urge Members to support his resolution.

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 403, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM TO FILE SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT ON H.R. 2432, PAPERWORK AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Government Reform be permitted to file a supplemental report to accompany H.R. 2432, the Paperwork and Regulatory Improvement Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

OSCAR SCOTT WOODY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3740) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 223 South Main Street in Roxboro, North Carolina, as the "Oscar Scott Woody Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3740

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. OSCAR SCOTT WOODY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 223

South Main Street in Roxboro, North Carolina, shall be known and designated as the "Oscar Scott Woody Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Oscar Scott Woody Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3740.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Committee on Government Reform, the House committee that has oversight responsibilities to the U.S. Postal Service, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 3740. This post office designation act honors Oscar Scott Woody, one of the postal service's little known heroes.

This legislation has been co-sponsored by the entire North Carolina congressional delegation.

Mr. Speaker, Oscar Scott Woody was among the 1,522 victims of the Titanic sinking in the early morning hours of April 15, 1912. Woody was a clerk of the U.S. Post Office Department, who lived in Clifton Springs, Virginia. He worked 15 years as a railroad mail clerk before joining the Postal Sea Service in 1910. Two years later, Woody was selected as one of five postal clerks to serve aboard the grand Titanic during its heavily anticipated maiden voyage.

While his invitation aboard the Titanic's ill-fated journey was professional in nature, he found time to celebrate his 44th birthday with his postal clerk colleagues on the night of April 14, 1912. That night, when the ship infamously crashed into an iceberg in the North Atlantic Ocean, Woody fled his party to salvage as much of the ship's mail as he could. Survivors of the Titanic's sinking reportedly last saw him desperately bagging up the mail in the ship's flooding post office.

Mr. Speaker, Oscar Scott Woody was born April 15, 1868 in Roxboro, North Carolina. I support this measure that names a post office after him in his hometown.

□ 1615

I want to recognize my esteemed colleague from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) for his work on H.R. 3740.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 3740, legislation naming a postal facility in Roxboro, North Carolina, after Oscar Scott Woody. This measure, which was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) on January 28, 2004, and unanimously reported by our committee on May 6, 2004, enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the North Carolina delegation.

Oscar Scott Woody was born on April 18, 1868, and lived in Fairfax County, Virginia. For 15 years, Mr. Woody worked as a railroad mail postal clerk, working the train route between Washington, D.C., and Greensboro, North Carolina.

In 1910, he was selected to serve with the Postal Sea Service. Two years later, Oscar was on the Titanic, serving with four other postal clerks.

According to news reports, Oscar Scott Woody was celebrating his 44th birthday aboard the great ship, the Titanic, when it began to sink. Survivors reported seeing Oscar and the other postal sea clerks trying to save the mail in the ship's post office.

Mr. Woody's body was later recovered, along with keys to the ship's mailboxes and "facing slips" which indicated the destination of the mail sack.

Mr. Speaker, once again we are witness to the hard work and dedication of postal employees, even in the face of death and disaster.

I commend my colleague for honoring postal sea clerk Oscar Scott Woody, and although the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MILLER) was unable to be here today, I know that he would be proud to see the passage of this bill, which names a postal facility after Mr. Woody.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that I have any other requests for time and urge its passage.

Mr. MILLER of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this legislation to designate the Roxboro, NC Postal Service facility as the Oscar Scott Woody Post Office.

Oscar Scott Woody, a native of Roxboro, North Carolina, was a sea post clerk aboard the Titanic. Woody worked 15 years as a railroad mail clerk, spending most of the time on trains running between Washington and Greensboro, North Carolina. He was selected in 1910 to join the sea post service.

The Titanic was not only the largest and most luxurious ocean liner of her time, she was also a Royal Mail Steamer. With five sea post clerks, the Titanic set sail for New York with over six million pieces of mail on board. The clerks worked throughout the voyage, sorting mail in the ship's state-of-the-art mailroom.

Sea post clerks were highly skilled and respected postal workers who sorted, canceled, and re-distributed the mail in transit. Regarded as the best of the best, these men typically sorted over 60,000 letters a day, making few, if any, errors in the process. Their hard work and efficiency allowed the mail to be delivered

immediately or forwarded directly to other destinations at the end of a voyage.

Mail was considered precious cargo and sea post clerks were expected to protect it at any cost.

On the evening of April 14, 1912, the sea post clerks took a break to celebrate Mr. Woody's forty-fourth birthday. During their celebration, the Titanic hit an iceberg. They returned to find the mail storage room, located in the forward hold that the iceberg had breached, flooding with water. The clerks desperately tried to save 200 sacks of registered mail by dragging them to the upper decks. Oscar Scott Woody was last seen alive at work, sloshing through the waist high freezing water to save the mail.

None of the mail clerks survived. Oscar Scott Woody's body was recovered a week later and buried at sea.

An exhibit at the Person County Museum of History in North Carolina notes Oscar Scott Woody's place in history. Governor Mike Easley proclaimed November 24, 2003 as "Oscar Scott Woody Day" in North Carolina.

Recognition of Woody's heroic efforts is long overdue. It is certainly fitting to name a North Carolina Post Office after a North Carolinian who gave his life upholding his duties to the U.S. Postal Service. Not only does this legislation recognize a postal hero, it serves as a recognition of the contributions made by postal workers and sea post clerks throughout our nation's history.

Mr. Woody certainly displayed the qualities with which North Carolinians take pride. This account was published by the Roxboro Courier on April 24, 1912:

"Mr. Woody stuck by his post and went down with hundreds of brave men, who scorned to take the places by the law of the sea and of Tar Heel chivalry [that] went to women first . . . More than one North Carolinian today, when it was learned that the dead mail-clerk hailed from down home, expressed their satisfaction that North Carolina courage had not been found wanting in that fearful test."

On May 1, 1912, an article about Mr. Woody in the same paper was published under the headline, "Died like a North Carolinian."

Loyal to the last, Mr. Woody was a true Tar Heel. He stuck by his post like his heels were covered in tar and did his job on that frightful night, choosing duty over his life. On his birthday, he never wavered from his duty, and for that all Tar Heels take pride.

I hope all my colleagues will join me in honoring a man who truly gave his life for his work by naming the Roxboro postal facility the Oscar Scott Woody Post Office.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 3740, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOOZMAN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3740.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

BOBBY MARSHALL GENTRY POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4176) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 122 West Elwood Avenue in Raeford, North Carolina, as the "Bobby Marshall Gentry Post Office Building".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4176

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. BOBBY MARSHALL GENTRY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 122 West Elwood Avenue in Raeford, North Carolina, shall be known and designated as the "Bobby Marshall Gentry Post Office Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the Bobby Marshall Gentry Post Office Building.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4176, the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4176 designates the U.S. Postal Service facility located at 122 West Elwood Avenue in Raeford, North Carolina, as the "Bobby Marshall Gentry Post Office Building." Like H.R. 3740, this bill enjoys the cosponsorship of the entire North Carolina congressional delegation.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my distinguished colleague and friend from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) for introducing H.R. 4176.

Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) and my friend the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) for helping participate today.

I rise today urging my colleagues to support H.R. 4176, legislation that would name the main post office in Raeford, North Carolina, in honor of their long-time mayor and my good friend, Bobby Marshall Gentry. Many qualities Bobby Marshall Gentry had. The old saying is "They also serve who only stand and wait." Let me tell my colleagues for sure, Bobby Marshall Gentry never stood and never waited. He moved forward for his town, for his church, for his family, for his children.

Mr. Gentry was elected to the Raeford City Council in February of 1977 and proceeded to serve the city of Raeford, North Carolina, faithfully for 26 years. In March of 1990, Bob was appointed to the post of mayor after the death of then current mayor, J.K. McNeill. Bob was elected in his own right as Raeford's mayor in 1993 and re-elected in 1997 and 2001. He served until his untimely death on October 29 of 2003. He served his country also as an Army veteran of the Korean War.

It is interesting to look at all the things that Mayor Gentry did, but one of his most proud accomplishments in those 26 years, only one time was there a tax increase. There were numerous tax decreases for which we all admired him.

Like most folks in Hoke County, I was shocked and saddened when I heard the news that Bob had died. Today I urge my colleagues to join me in remembering a great man who I am proud to have called my friend.

Mr. Speaker, Bob Gentry was a popular mayor. Folks in the community appreciated, admired and really liked him a lot. In fact, I do not think it is too much of a stretch to say that the Raeford community loved Mayor Gentry. Once, when asked why he ran for office, Bob replied as if it were just simple common sense, "I enjoyed it so much that I could not resist running again and again."

Bob was known for his ability to not only accomplish good things for Raeford, but he was able to genuinely have a good time serving and accomplishing these many ends.

Raeford, North Carolina, is a small town in my district, but this small-town mayor was a big-time leader who was constantly looking out for the town and the people. He passionately pursued economic development opportunities. Under his leadership, Raeford was put on track for the largest downtown development in Raeford's history. As a long-time and loyal employee of Burlington Mills for 17 years, he also owned his own small business. He was a contributor. He was a giver.

Mayor Gentry was appointed to the Lumber River Council of Governments board of directors in February of 1990. He served as chairman of this group for several terms and was known by his fellow board members as a leader who believed in starting on time, getting your work done and adjourning on time.

Bob greatly admired another great North Carolinian, former United States

Senator Jesse Helms. He once said of Senator Helms, "His integrity is beyond reproach. When he thinks he is right, he will not compromise his position for political acceptance or gain. His morals are of the highest standards."

We were members of different political parties, but his admiration for Senator Helms and his befriending of me and shepherding me through the process showed clearly his focus was always people and not politics.

Mayor Gentry was a hardworking mayor. He left a legacy with his community. His vision for the future and his determination made Raeford a better place to live and work.

Mr. Speaker, in a small city like Raeford, you often see your friends and neighbors at the post office. It is the kind of place where people say hello and get caught up on what is happening around town. It is very fitting then that today the Raeford community joins me in support of naming the Raeford Post Office, a building at the center of the community, in honor of our former mayor Bob Gentry.

To his wife Eleanor, I had the privilege, Mr. Speaker, of attending the celebration of his life, the funeral service for him, and to Eleanor, there is a passage of scripture, "In my Father's House, there are many mansions. I have gone to prepare a place for you." Well, Bob Gentry is in heaven right now making sure that water and sewer are taken care of, that the lights are on, and preparing a place for Eleanor and his family and others.

To Marsha, Gary and Mark, his children; to his five grandchildren, Marshall, Lucas, Katie, Kelly and Liam, their grandfather was a wonderful man. He leaves many memories of a life well-lived, a good and faithful servant who has gone on before, who served in many, many ways.

Honesty, integrity, intense commitment, these are the qualities, among many, that signified our friend, Bobby Marshall Gentry.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and honor my friend, a fine public servant.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the House Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join my colleague in consideration of H.R. 4176, legislation naming a postal facility in Raeford, North Carolina, after Bobby Marshall Gentry. This measure, which was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) on April 20, 2004, and unanimously reported by our committee on May 6, enjoys the support and cosponsorship of the entire North Carolina delegation.

Bobby Gentry, as we have heard, a lifelong resident of Raeford, was a businessman and long-time member of the political establishment in his community. He served on the Raeford City Council for 13 years, from 1977 to 1990,

and was appointed mayor in 1990. He then went on to win three mayoral elections after that.

Sadly, on October 29, 2003, Mayor Gentry passed away of a heart attack. Earlier that day, he had played golf with friends and was out having dinner.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, the Raeford community, postmaster and mayor are all in support of this measure. I want to commend my friend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) for introducing it, and I urge its passage.

I do not have any other speakers.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Not everyone knows my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), did not spend his life in Chicago. He grew up in the rural south, and I bet he knew people like Bobby Gentry, the kind of folks you are glad to see on the streets. It particularly pleases me and the people in my community for the gentleman to stand in honoring the memory and life of a man who grew up in a rural farming community, but did many great things from that platform.

I thank the gentleman for his help and support.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman, and it is a pleasure to be here with my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to again acknowledge my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), for his work on H.R. 4176 and the work of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), and I urge all of the Members to support its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURPHY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4176.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

CONTINUATION OF NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 108-186)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the Burma emergency is to continue beyond May 20, 2004, to the Federal Register for publication. The most recent notice continuing this emergency was published in the Federal Register on May 19, 2003.

The crisis between the United States and Burma, constituted by the actions and policies of the Government of Burma, including its policies of committing large-scale repression of the democratic opposition in Burma that led to the declaration of a national emergency on May 20, 1997, has not been resolved. These actions and policies are hostile to U.S. interests and pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency with respect to Burma and maintain in force the sanctions against Burma to respond to this threat.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 2004.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Con. Res. 420, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 423, by the yeas and nays; and

H. Con. Res. 403, by the yeas and nays.

The remaining votes will be taken on a later day.

The first and third electronic votes will be conducted as 15-minute votes.

The second vote in this series will be a 5-minute vote.

APPLAUDING THE MEN AND WOMEN WHO KEEP AMERICA MOVING AND RECOGNIZING NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 420.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 420, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 360, nays 0, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 177]

YEAS—360

Abercrombie	Cox	Green (WI)
Ackerman	Cramer	Greenwood
Aderholt	Crane	Grijalva
Akin	Crenshaw	Hall
Alexander	Crowley	Harman
Baca	Cubin	Harris
Baird	Culberson	Hart
Baker	Cunningham	Hastings (FL)
Baldwin	Davis (CA)	Hastings (WA)
Ballance	Davis (FL)	Hayes
Ballenger	Davis (IL)	Hayworth
Barrett (SC)	Davis (TN)	Hefley
Bartlett (MD)	Davis, Jo Ann	Hensarling
Barton (TX)	Davis, Tom	Herger
Bass	Deal (GA)	Hill
Beauprez	DeGette	Hinchey
Bereuter	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Berkley	DeLauro	Hobson
Berman	DeLay	Hoefel
Berry	Deutsch	Hoekstra
Biggert	Diaz-Balart, L.	Holden
Bilirakis	Diaz-Balart, M.	Holt
Bishop (GA)	Dicks	Honda
Bishop (NY)	Dingell	Hooley (OR)
Bishop (UT)	Doggett	Hostettler
Blackburn	Dooley (CA)	Houghton
Blunt	Doolittle	Hoyer
Boehlert	Doyle	Hulshof
Boehner	Dreier	Hunter
Bonilla	Duncan	Hyde
Bonner	Dunn	Inslee
Bono	Edwards	Israel
Boozman	Ehlers	Issa
Boswell	Emanuel	Jackson (IL)
Boucher	Emerson	Jackson-Lee
Boyd	Engel	(TX)
Bradley (NH)	Eshoo	Jefferson
Brady (TX)	Etheridge	John
Brown (OH)	Evans	Johnson (CT)
Brown (SC)	Everett	Johnson, E. B.
Brown-Waite,	Farr	Johnson, Sam
Ginny	Fattah	Jones (NC)
Burgess	Feeney	Jones (OH)
Burns	Ferguson	Kanjorski
Buyer	Filner	Kaptur
Calvert	Foley	Keller
Camp	Ford	Kelly
Cannon	Frank (MA)	Kennedy (MN)
Cantor	Franks (AZ)	Kennedy (RI)
Capito	Frelinghuysen	Kildee
Capps	Frost	Kind
Capuano	Galleghy	King (IA)
Cardin	Garrett (NJ)	King (NY)
Cardoza	Gerlach	Kingston
Carter	Gibbons	Kirk
Case	Gilchrest	Kleccka
Castle	Gillmor	Kline
Chabot	Gonzalez	Kolbe
Chandler	Goode	LaHood
Chocola	Goodlatte	Lampson
Coble	Gordon	Langevin
Cole	Goss	Lantos
Conyers	Granger	Larsen (WA)
Cooper	Graves	Larson (CT)
Costello	Green (TX)	Latham

LaTourette	Osborne	Shuster
Lee	Ose	Simmons
Levin	Otter	Simpson
Lewis (CA)	Oxley	Skelton
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Smith (MI)
Lewis (KY)	Pascrell	Smith (NJ)
Linder	Pastor	Smith (WA)
LoBiondo	Paul	Snyder
Lofgren	Pearce	Solis
Lucas (KY)	Pelosi	Souder
Lucas (OK)	Pence	Spratt
Lynch	Peterson (MN)	Stark
Majette	Petri	Stearns
Manzullo	Pickering	Stenholm
Markey	Pitts	Strickland
Marshall	Pombo	Stupak
Matheson	Porter	Sullivan
Matsui	Portman	Tancredo
McCarthy (MO)	Putnam	Tauscher
McCarthy (NY)	Quinn	Taylor (MS)
McCollum	Radanovich	Terry
McCotter	Rahall	Thomas
McCrery	Ramstad	Thompson (CA)
McDermott	Regula	Thompson (MS)
McGovern	Rehberg	Thornberry
McHugh	Renzi	Tiberi
McInnis	Reynolds	Tierney
McIntyre	Rodriguez	Toomey
McKeon	Rogers (AL)	Turner (OH)
McNulty	Rogers (KY)	Turner (TX)
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Udall (CO)
Meek (FL)	Ross	Udall (NM)
Menendez	Rothman	Upton
Mica	Roybal-Allard	Van Hollen
Michaud	Royce	Visclosky
Millender-	Ruppersberger	Vitter
McDonald	Ryan (OH)	Walden (OR)
Miller (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Walsh
Miller (MI)	Sabo	Waters
Miller, Gary	Sanchez, Linda	Watson
Miller, George	T.	Watt
Mollohan	Sanchez, Loretta	Waxman
Moran (VA)	Sandlin	Weldon (FL)
Murphy	Saxton	Weldon (PA)
Musgrave	Schakowsky	Weller
Myrick	Schiff	Wexler
Nadler	Schrock	Whitfield
Napolitano	Scott (GA)	Wicker
Nethercutt	Scott (VA)	Wilson (NM)
Neugebauer	Sensenbrenner	Wilson (SC)
Northup	Serrano	Wolf
Norwood	Sessions	Wu
Nunes	Shadegg	Wynn
Nussle	Shaw	Young (AK)
Obey	Sherman	Young (FL)
Olver	Sherwood	
Ortiz	Shimkus	

NOT VOTING—73

Allen	Gutierrez
Andrews	Gutknecht
Bachus	Isakson
Becerra	Istook
Bell	Jenkins
Blumenauer	Johnson (IL)
Brady (PA)	Kilpatrick
Brown, Corrine	Knollenberg
Burr	Kucinich
Burton (IN)	Leach
Carson (IN)	Lipinski
Carson (OK)	Lowey
Clay	Maloney
Clyburn	Meeks (NY)
Collins	Miller (NC)
Cummings	Moore
Davis (AL)	Moran (KS)
DeFazio	Murtha
DeMint	Neal (MA)
English	Ney
Flake	Oberstar
Forbes	Owens
Fossella	Payne
Gephardt	Peterson (PA)
Gingrey	Platts

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN) (during the vote). Members are advised 2 minutes remain in this vote.

□ 1857

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 177 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 177 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR ACTIVITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THE DEDICATION OF THE NATIONAL WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 423.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. PORTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 423, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 364, nays 0, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

YEAS—364

Abercrombie	Capuano	Etheridge
Ackerman	Cardin	Evans
Aderholt	Cardoza	Everett
Akin	Carter	Farr
Alexander	Case	Fattah
Baca	Castle	Feeney
Baird	Chabot	Ferguson
Baker	Chandler	Filner
Baldwin	Chocola	Foley
Ballance	Coble	Ford
Ballenger	Cole	Frank (MA)
Barrett (SC)	Conyers	Franks (AZ)
Barlett (MD)	Cooper	Frelinghuysen
Barton (TX)	Costello	Frost
Bass	Cox	Gallely
Beauprez	Cramer	Garrett (NJ)
Bereuter	Crane	Gerlach
Berkley	Crenshaw	Gibbons
Berman	Crowley	Gilchrest
Berry	Cubin	Gillmor
Biggart	Culberson	Gonzalez
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Goode
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Goodlatte
Bishop (NY)	Davis (FL)	Gordon
Bishop (UT)	Davis (IL)	Goss
Blackburn	Davis (TN)	Granger
Blunt	Davis, Jo Ann	Graves
Boehlert	Davis, Tom	Green (TX)
Boehner	Deal (GA)	Green (WI)
Bonilla	DeGette	Greenwood
Bonner	Delahunt	Grijalva
Bono	DeLauro	Gutknecht
Boozman	DeLay	Hall
Boswell	Deutsch	Harman
Boucher	Diaz-Balart, L.	Harris
Boyd	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hart
Bradley (NH)	Dicks	Hastings (FL)
Brady (TX)	Dingell	Hastings (WA)
Brown (OH)	Doggett	Hayes
Brown (SC)	Dooley (CA)	Hayworth
Brown-Waite	Doolittle	Hefley
Ginny	Doyle	Hensarling
Burgess	Dreier	Herger
Burns	Duncan	Hill
Buyer	Dunn	Hinchey
Calvert	Edwards	Hinojosa
Camp	Ehlers	Hobson
Cannon	Emanuel	Hoeffel
Cantor	Emerson	Hoekstra
Capito	Engel	Holden
Capps	Eshoo	Holt

Honda	McIntyre	Sanchez, Loretta
Hooley (OR)	McKeon	Sandlin
Hostettler	McNulty	Saxton
Houghton	Meehan	Schakowsky
Hoyer	Meek (FL)	Schiff
Hulshof	Menendez	Schrock
Hunter	Mica	Scott (GA)
Hyde	Michaud	Scott (VA)
Inslee	Millender-	Sensenbrenner
Israel	McDonald	Serrano
Issa	Miller (FL)	Sessions
Jackson (IL)	Miller (MI)	Shadegg
Jackson-Lee	Miller, Gary	Shaw
(TX)	Miller, George	Sherman
Jefferson	Mollohan	Sherwood
John	Moran (VA)	Shimkus
Johnson (CT)	Murphy	Shuster
Johnson (IL)	Musgrave	Simmons
Johnson, E. B.	Myrick	Simpson
Johnson, Sam	Nadler	Skelton
Jones (NC)	Napolitano	Smith (MI)
Jones (OH)	Nethercutt	Smith (NJ)
Kanjorski	Neugebauer	Smith (WA)
Kaptur	Northup	Snyder
Keller	Norwood	Solis
Kelly	Nunes	Souder
Kennedy (MN)	Nussle	Spratt
Kennedy (RI)	Obey	Stark
Kildee	Olver	Stearns
Kind	Ortiz	Stenholm
King (IA)	Osborne	Strickland
King (NY)	Ose	Stupak
Kingston	Otter	Sullivan
Kirk	Oxley	Tancredo
Klecicka	Pallone	Tauscher
Kline	Pascrell	Taylor (MS)
Kolbe	Pastor	Terry
LaHood	Paul	Thomas
Lampson	Pearce	Thompson (CA)
Langevin	Pelosi	Thompson (MS)
Lantos	Pence	Thornberry
Larsen (WA)	Peterson (MN)	Tiberi
Larson (CT)	Petri	Tierney
Latham	Pickering	Toomey
LaTourette	Pitts	Turner (OH)
Lee	Platts	Turner (TX)
Levin	Pombo	Udall (CO)
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Udall (NM)
Lewis (GA)	Portman	Upton
Lewis (KY)	Putnam	Van Hollen
Linder	Quinn	Visclosky
LoBiondo	Radanovich	Vitter
Lofgren	Rahall	Walden (OR)
Lucas (KY)	Ramstad	Walsh
Lucas (OK)	Regula	Waters
Lynch	Rehberg	Watson
Majette	Renzi	Watt
Maloney	Reynolds	Waxman
Manzullo	Rodriguez	Weldon (FL)
Markey	Rogers (AL)	Weldon (PA)
Marshall	Rogers (KY)	Weller
Matheson	Rohrabacher	Wexler
Matsui	Ross	Whitfield
McCarthy (MO)	Rothman	Wicker
McCarthy (NY)	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (NM)
McCollum	Royce	Wilson (SC)
McCotter	Ruppersberger	Wolf
McCrery	Ryan (OH)	Wu
McDermott	Ryan (WI)	Wynn
McGovern	Sabo	Young (AK)
McHugh	Sanchez, Linda	Young (FL)
McInnis	T.	

NOT VOTING—69

Allen	Gephardt	Pomeroy
Andrews	Gingrey	Price (NC)
Bachus	Gutierrez	Pryce (OH)
Becerra	Isakson	Rangel
Bell	Istook	Reyes
Blumenauer	Jenkins	Rogers (MI)
Brady (PA)	Kilpatrick	Ros-Lehtinen
Brown, Corrine	Knollenberg	Rush
Burr	Kucinich	Ryun (KS)
Burton (IN)	Leach	Sanders
Carson (IN)	Lipinski	Shays
Carson (OK)	Lowey	Slaughter
Clay	Meeks (NY)	Smith (TX)
Clyburn	Miller (NC)	Sweeney
Collins	Moore	Tanner
Cummings	Moran (KS)	Tauzin
Davis (AL)	Murtha	Taylor (NC)
DeFazio	Neal (MA)	Tiahrt
DeMint	Ney	Towns
English	Oberstar	Velázquez
Flake	Owens	Wamp
Forbes	Payne	Weiner
Fossella	Peterson (PA)	Woolsey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN) (during the vote). Members are advised that there are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1905

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDEMNING GOVERNMENT OF REPUBLIC OF SUDAN FOR ATTACKS AGAINST INNOCENT CIVILIANS IN IMPOVERISHED DARFUR REGION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 403, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 403, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 360, nays 1, not voting 72, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

YEAS—360

Abercrombie	Camp	Doyle
Ackerman	Cannon	Dreier
Aderholt	Cantor	Duncan
Akin	Capito	Dunn
Alexander	Capps	Edwards
Baca	Capuano	Ehlers
Baird	Cardin	Emanuel
Baker	Cardoza	Emerson
Baldwin	Carter	Engel
Ballance	Case	Eshoo
Ballenger	Castle	Etheridge
Barrett (SC)	Chabot	Evans
Bartlett (MD)	Chandler	Everett
Barton (TX)	Chocola	Farr
Bass	Coble	Fattah
Beauprez	Cole	Feeney
Bereuter	Conyers	Ferguson
Berkley	Cooper	Pinler
Berman	Costello	Foley
Berry	Cox	Ford
Biggert	Cramer	Frank (MA)
Bilirakis	Crane	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (GA)	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (NY)	Crowley	Frost
Bishop (UT)	Cubin	Galleghy
Blackburn	Culberson	Garrett (NJ)
Blunt	Cunningham	Gerlach
Boehlert	Davis (CA)	Gibbons
Boehner	Davis (FL)	Gilchrest
Bonilla	Davis (IL)	Gillmor
Bonner	Davis (TN)	Gonzalez
Bono	Davis, Jo Ann	Goode
Boozman	Davis, Tom	Goodlatte
Boswell	Deal (GA)	Gordon
Boucher	DeGette	Goss
Boyd	Delahunt	Granger
Bradley (NH)	DeLauro	Graves
Brady (TX)	DeLay	Green (TX)
Brown (OH)	Deutsch	Green (WI)
Brown (SC)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Greenwood
Brown-Waite,	Diaz-Balart, M.	Grijalva
Ginny	Dicks	Gutknecht
Burgess	Dingell	Hall
Burns	Doggett	Harman
Buyer	Dooley (CA)	Harris
Calvert	Doolittle	Hart

Hastings (FL)	McCarthy (MO)	Sabo
Hastings (WA)	McCarthy (NY)	Sánchez, Linda
Hayes	McCollum	T.
Hayworth	McCotter	Sanchez, Loretta
Hefley	McCrery	Sandlin
Herger	McDermott	Saxton
Hill	McGovern	Schakowsky
Hinchee	McHugh	Schiff
Hinojosa	McInnis	Schrock
Hobson	McIntyre	Scott (GA)
Hoeffel	McKeon	Scott (VA)
Hoekstra	McNulty	Sensenbrenner
Holden	Meehan	Serrano
Holt	Meek (FL)	Sessions
Honda	Menendez	Shadegg
Hooley (OR)	Mica	Shaw
Hostettler	Michaud	Sherman
Houghton	Millender-	Sherwood
Hoyer	McDonald	Shimkus
Hulshof	Miller (FL)	Shuster
Hunter	Miller (MI)	Simmons
Hyde	Miller, Gary	Simpson
Inslee	Miller, George	Skelton
Israel	Mollohan	Smith (MI)
Issa	Moran (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Jackson (IL)	Murphy	Smith (WA)
Jackson-Lee	Musgrave	Snyder
(TX)	Myrick	Solis
Jefferson	Nadler	Souder
John	Napolitano	Spratt
Johnson (CT)	Nethercutt	Stark
Johnson (IL)	Neugebauer	Stearns
Johnson, E. B.	Norwood	Stenholm
Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Strickland
Jones (NC)	Nussle	Stupak
Jones (OH)	Obey	Sullivan
Kanjorski	Olver	Tancredo
Kaptur	Ortiz	Tauscher
Keller	Osborne	Taylor (MS)
Kelly	Ose	Terry
Kennedy (MN)	Otter	Thomas
Kennedy (RI)	Pallone	Thompson (CA)
Kildee	Pascarell	Thompson (MS)
Kind	Pastor	Thornberry
King (IA)	Pearce	Tiberi
King (NY)	Pelosi	Tierney
Kingston	Pence	Toomey
Kirk	Peterson (MN)	Turner (OH)
Kleczka	Petri	Turner (TX)
Kline	Pickering	Udall (CO)
Kolbe	Pitts	Udall (NM)
LaHood	Platts	Upton
Langevin	Pombo	Van Hollen
Lantos	Porter	Visclosky
Larsen (WA)	Portman	Vitter
Larson (CT)	Putnam	Walden (OR)
Latham	Quinn	Walsh
LaTourette	Radanovich	Waters
Lee	Rahall	Watson
Levin	Ramstad	Watt
Lewis (CA)	Regula	Waxman
Lewis (GA)	Rehberg	Weldon (FL)
Lewis (KY)	Renzi	Weldon (PA)
Linder	Reynolds	Weller
LoBiondo	Rodriguez	Wexler
Lofgren	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
Lucas (KY)	Rogers (KY)	Wicker
Lucas (OK)	Rohrabacher	Wilson (NM)
Lynch	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson (SC)
Majette	Ross	Wolf
Maloney	Rothman	Wu
Manzullo	Roybal-Allard	Wynn
Markey	Royce	Young (AK)
Marshall	Ruppersberger	Young (FL)
Matheson	Ryan (OH)	
Matsui	Ryan (WI)	

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—72

Allen	DeMint	Lowey
Andrews	English	Meeks (NY)
Bachus	Flake	Miller (NC)
Becerra	Forbes	Moore
Bell	Fossella	Moran (KS)
Blumenauer	Gephardt	Murtha
Brady (PA)	Gingrey	Neal (MA)
Brown, Corrine	Gutierrez	Ney
Burr	Hensarling	Northup
Burton (IN)	Isakson	Oberstar
Carson (IN)	Istook	Owens
Carson (OK)	Jenkins	Oxley
Clay	Kilpatrick	Payne
Clyburn	Knollenberg	Peterson (PA)
Collins	Kucinich	Pomeroy
Cummings	Lampson	Price (NC)
Davis (AL)	Leach	Pryce (OH)
DeFazio	Lipinski	Rangel

Reyes	Slaughter	Tiahrt
Rogers (MI)	Smith (TX)	Towns
Rush	Sweeney	Velázquez
Ryun (KS)	Tanner	Wamp
Sanders	Tauzin	Weiner
Shays	Taylor (NC)	Woolsey

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT) (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1922

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I was regrettably delayed in my return to Washington, DC and therefore unable to be on the House Floor for rollcall votes 177, 178, and 179. Had I been here I would have voted "yea" for rollcall vote 177, "yea" for rollcall vote 178, and "yea" for rollcall vote 179.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I was not present for rollcall vote 177, Recognizing National Transportation Week; rollcall vote 178, Authorizing Capitol Grounds for the Dedication of WWII Memorial; rollcall vote 179, Condemning the Sudan for civilian attacks in the Darfur region.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" for rollcall votes 177, 178 and 179.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 177, 178, 179 due to bad weather, which delayed my flight. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 177, 178, 179.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 17, 2004, I traveled to Topeka, Kansas, to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the historic Brown v. Board of Education ruling in which the United States Supreme Court determined that separating students by race was inherently unequal and unconstitutional.

During my absence, the House of Representatives considered H. Con. Res. 420, a Resolution recognizing National Transportation Week, H. Con. Res. 423, a Resolution authorizing use of the Capitol Grounds for the dedication of the World War II Memorial, and H. Con. Res. 403, a Resolution condemning the Sudan for civilian attacks in the Darfur region.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on all three of the above referenced bills.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, personal reasons prevent me from being present for legislative business scheduled for today, Monday, May 17, 2004. Had I been present, I

would have voted "yea" on H. Con. Res. 420, a resolution applauding the men and women who keep America moving and recognizing National Transportation Week (Rollcall No. 177); "yea" on H. Con. Res. 423, a resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for activities associated with the dedication of the National World War II Memorial (Rollcall No. 178); and "yea" on H. Con. Res. 403, a resolution condemning the Government of the Republic of the Sudan for its attacks against innocent civilians in the impoverished Darfur region of western Sudan (Rollcall No. 179).

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2660, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2004

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, subject to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on H.R. 2660, Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2005.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. George Miller of California moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2660 be instructed to insist on reporting an amendment to prohibit the Department of Labor from using funds under the Act to implement any portion of a regulation that would make any employee ineligible for overtime pay who would otherwise qualify for overtime pay under regulations under section 13 of the Fair Labor Standards Act in effect September 3, 2003, except that nothing in the amendment shall affect the increased salary requirements provided in such regulations as specified in section 541 of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations, as promulgated on April 23, 2004.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON S. CON. RES. 95, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, subject to rule XXII, clause 7(c), I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct on S. Con. Res. 95, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2005.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Stenholm moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the House amendment to the concurrent resolution S. Con. Res. 95 be instructed, within the scope of the conference, to reject provisions that provide for an increase in the statutory debt limit.

CONGRATULATING SONIA GANDHI, INDIA'S NEW PRIME MINISTER

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer congratulations and best wishes to Sonia Gandhi, India's next Prime Minister.

India, the world's largest democracy, reminds us that people can change the course of their country without violence. In these troubled times, India has given us another valuable lesson. It is not the first time the world has looked to India and learned.

Another Gandhi changed his country and changed the world by relying on ideas instead of violence, by believing in people and the common good.

Mahatma Gandhi once said, "You must be the change you wish to see in the world." How true those words are today.

The voices of a billion Indians have spoken, and India today stands tall in the international community. We look forward to working toward peace with the Indian people and their new Prime Minister.

THE PRESIDENT'S RECORD ON OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS DRILLING

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, the President recently said that he unambiguously opposes oil and gas drilling off the coast of Florida, but 2 years ago, he proposed weakening the very law that Florida and California used to protect their valuable coastlines from new drilling.

Then the President threw his support behind an energy bill that undermines the bipartisan agreement against new drilling off Florida, California and other coastal States.

Now the President is considering a report from the National Petroleum Council, a group composed mainly of energy executives, which has recommended drilling off Florida, California and coastal States.

Mr. Speaker, these actions show how out of step the President's policies are with coastal communities. By contrast, Senator KERRY has a long record opposing offshore oil drilling.

He passed legislation to impose a moratorium on drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf, blocking oil and gas companies from drilling in environmentally sensitive areas; and he has sought long-term solutions that make sense for energy development and that balance environmental protection and economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, the President should be supporting policies to protect our valuable coastal communities. In short, he should be doing what Senator KERRY is doing.

OFF-SHORE OIL DRILLING

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I think most people rec-

ognize that California often leads the Nation in its efforts to protect the environment. It also leads the Nation as the most efficient user of energy.

There are few issues more unifying than the importance of protecting our coasts from the impacts of offshore oil drilling.

Time and again, local, State and Federal officials in both parties have supported a moratorium on offshore oil drilling. Yet, despite the campaign rhetoric claiming to oppose offshore drilling, this administration has attempted every backdoor route to weaken coastal protections. All we have to do is look at the energy bill and find numerous provisions supported by the administration that paved the way to drilling off the coast of California.

In fact, just this month Aera, a subsidiary of Shell/ExxonMobil, indicated it is moving forward with its intentions to develop several leases off the coast of Santa Barbara that are not subject to the drilling moratorium.

The President stepped in in the same situation in Florida and bought out those leases, Florida, a State where his brother is Governor, but he will not do this in California.

Further, the administration, through the energy bill, has repeatedly tried to weaken the State of California's ability to regulate the activities at the State level that might impact our coasts.

REPUBLICAN ENERGY BILL

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the Republican energy bill includes dangerous provisions that would overturn long-standing moratoria on drilling in new areas of the Outer Continental Shelf and gut States' rights.

President Bush supports an inventory on the Outer Continental Shelf that would threaten the long-standing moratoria on new drilling in the OCS off the entire East Coast and lead to new drilling.

The inventory is unnecessary. The Minerals Management Service already conducts a survey every 5 years, the latest published in 2000. The assessment includes estimates of undiscovered oil and natural gas that is conventionally and economically recoverable.

The President should be seeking long-term solutions that make sense for energy development and that balance environmental protection and economic growth. Instead, he wants to gut the moratorium on oil and gas drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf and weaken States' rights under the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Mr. Speaker, States have used the Coastal Zone Management Act to protect their valuable coastlines from new offshore drilling. The President should be working to enforce our laws and not weaken them.

HONORING VONNY HILTON SWEENEY

(Ms. WATSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to someone who has made celebrities while she stayed in the background. Her name is Vonny Hilton Sweeney.

She set high goals and obtained one of the most prestigious achievements by becoming the first black majorette while attending Brownsville High School in Pennsylvania. She was married to Howard James Sweeney and had one son. She worked at a community hospital in north Sacramento and received a B.A. in English and journalism from Sacramento State University. She was a contributing editor for the Sacramento Observer.

She moved to Los Angeles in 1966 to pursue her career in the entertainment industry where she was promotion coordinator for Sussex Records, vice president of promotion and publicity for Hugh Hefner's Playboy Records Company, and received her first gold record for the hit single "Falling In Love" recorded by Hamilton Joe-Frank and Reynolds. She was also a publicist for Janet DuBois and one of the first female managers for such acts.

She was the public directions director for over 25 years for James Brown entertainment including current editor of his Truth Magazine. As an icon in the James Brown organization, she was personally responsible for showcase venues worldwide, his biggest fan, as well as the dearest friend over many decades. In 1992, 1993 and 1994 she was listed in the "Who's Who" of entertainment.

As a mentor, one of her attributes was to become involved with other people's lives, and was instrumental in helping individuals achieve and reach their dreams. Her goal in life was to pursue the dreams and goals of others through her dedication and guidance in all aspects of the entertainment industry.

Vonny Hilton Sweeney was preceded in death by her loving parents James and Anna Rea Hilton and her brother James Thompson. She is survived by her son Howard James Sweeney, wife Jennifer, and granddaughter Jade Sweeney and step-grandson Justin McCarthy, brother Walter Thompson, his wife Jerri, sister Rose Alma King, sister Barbara Hilton Brown, her husband John L. plus numerous nieces, nephews and many friends.

□ 1930

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

SUPPORT THE ASSAULT WEAPONS BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind everybody there are only 119 days before the assault weapons ban goes back on our streets. As the Million Mom March begins its Halt the Assault tour beginning tomorrow, I think it is important to remember the support the assault weapons ban has across this country.

I want to remind people that in California, KSBW television said recently, "We call on the Congress to keep assault weapons where they belong, with our military and with our police." On the other side of the country, the Worcester Telegraph and Herald says, "Banning assault weapons in no way limits individuals' ability to buy, own, or sell legitimate sporting firearms." In the South, the New Orleans editorialized, "There's no justification for legalizing the 19 military-style weapons covered by the ban." In the Midwest, the Springfield Illinois State Journal-Register wrote, "No reasonable gun owner should oppose the Federal assault weapons ban."

All across the country, the Nation's leading newspapers are reflecting the opinion of the American people. They want the assault weapons ban renewed. Strip away the rhetoric and the polls and the focus groups, and gun violence is about destroying lives. How many more lives will we destroy by putting assault weapons back on our streets?

Each week, I get up and I say to the American people, you can make a difference. Each week, I get up and remind people that we need to have the assault weapons ban renewed. September 13 is coming up soon.

When you start talking to our police officers across the country and how involved they are in this issue, people have to remember why we passed the assault weapons ban in the first place, because our police officers were being mowed down. Assault weapons were used in killings in our schools.

We can stop this, but we need the American people's help. You can make a difference. You can make a difference. I have always said one person can make a difference, because first it is one, and then two, and it multiplies across this Nation. But we need to hear your voices. We need to have you contact your Members of Congress, the Members of the Senate.

We need to hear your voices. That is the only way we are going to get that bill up here on the House floor. The President has promised to sign the bill if it gets on his desk. We have to make sure that the bill is passed here through the House. We know we can

pass it in the Senate and have it put on the President's desk.

I personally believe it should be made permanent. I also believe that copycats of the guns that were used, say in the D.C. sniper shooting, which was the Bushmaster, should not be allowed to be copycat. I saw in the paper the other day that one of our gun manufacturers just got a very large contract for the military so that the people in Iraq, their soldiers, will have our guns. So I think we can see where the guns are going for war.

Let me remind people: AK-47s and Uzis, these are the guns you see every night on TV; these are the guns we see our young men and women use to go fight the war in Iraq. And that is where they belong, in a war, not on our streets. They should not be allowed in our communities. They certainly should not be allowed to be bought and sold by the drug gangs we have throughout this country today.

This is what we need to do. I am asking the American people for help. I will do my part here in Washington, but I need your voices across the country to make sure we have the bill come up for a vote. That will be your job: contact your representatives. Do your part. Do not always say, let them do it; you have to get involved in this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MOMENTUM CONTINUES ON DRUG IMPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I am not certain I can do this Special Order without my charts. It is different for me to be down here without charts, but I am going to talk about prescription drugs. And for those of us who believe that Americans ought to have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices, last week was a very good week.

In fact, let me just review some of the things that have happened just since May 4. On May 4, Health and Human Services Secretary Tommy Thompson said, "I think it is coming," referring to the legislation to legalize the importation of prescription drugs.

On May 5, the CEO of CVS Pharmacies, one of the largest in America, Tom Ryan, said, and I quote, "Millions of Americans have already opted to import drugs because they cannot afford not to. To do otherwise," referring to the importation legislation, "would be to ignore the millions of Americans who, as we speak, are forced to go outside our existing system, which is intended to ensure drug safety, in order

to preserve their pocketbook." That is what Tom Ryan said, who as I say, is president and CEO of CVS Pharmacies.

On May 6, Walgreen's, their CEO, came out and said essentially the same thing. Through a written statement, they said, "If importation is legalized, we will actively participate in filling prescriptions for patients. It is a way to provide some relief to those we see every day in our pharmacies."

On May 9, the Chicago Tribune editorialized and said in their headline: "The Drug Import Juggernaut," and they highlighted the growing momentum for drug importation. They said in that editorial, and I quote, "Simply relying on the American consumers to pick up the slack is indefensible."

And on May 10, a Minnesota District Court judge granted our State Attorney General's request to compel GlaxoSmithKline to produce documents related to the company's efforts to cut off Canadian drug imports to the U.S. This is a landmark decision, and it is the first time a judge has stated, and I quote, "Not only drug importation is illegal."

Mr. Speaker, the momentum continues to grow to allow Americans to have access to world-class drugs at world-market prices. As I have said here many times with my charts, I think we as Americans live in a blessed country. We should be willing to pay our fair share for the prescription drugs which help save our lives. But it is really unfortunate that we are forced to subsidize countries around the world. I think we ought to pay our fair share, but we should not be forced to subsidize the starving Swiss.

And there are several other solutions people have proposed; but ultimately, I, like Ronald Reagan, believe markets are more powerful than armies. The time has come to open up those markets, allow Americans to have access to those drugs at world-market prices.

BROWN V. BOARD OF EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments to remember the 50th anniversary of the Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education. May 17, 1954, became a history-making day.

I was 14 years old, in the ninth grade, when the Brown decision was issued. I rode to school on a broken-down school bus. I was taught in a dilapidated schoolhouse. I had hand-me-down books and sat in an overcrowded classroom. When the word of the Brown decision reached me outside of Troy, Alabama, I thought the very next school year I would be able to attend an integrated school. But it did not happen for me. It did not happen for many African American children for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, laws set the standard in America, but that is

only one important part of the so-called contract in a democracy. Courts can hand down the law, but the people must be willing to abide by the law before it has power. So it took some time before school integration came to many parts of the American South. But the Brown decision was the first powerful step in the modern-day civil rights movement. It set the tone and laid the groundwork for what was to come. It said once and for all that segregation was dead. It said separate could never ever be equal.

So it was only a matter of time before the whole system of American apartheid would come to an end. But perhaps most important, Mr. Speaker, the Brown decision was an inspiration. It gave hope to so many throughout the South. It was the first time we had ever had an indication that anyone in the Federal Government knew about the injustice we suffered, and it was the first time we had ever heard any government agent agree that it was wrong.

The Brown decision strengthened the resolve of people already involved in the struggle for civil rights, and it encouraged hundreds and thousands of young people like me to believe a new day could come in America. And that is why the Brown decision is so important to remember.

Many people never dreamed that they would ever see the end of segregation, but the Brown decision helped them to see that a persistent call for justice in America can bring change. That is why we cannot give in, we cannot give up, and we cannot give out, Mr. Speaker, until the promise of the Brown decision is fully realized in America.

We have come a long way in 50 years, but we still have a great distance to go before we lay down the burden of race in America. But our struggle is more than one decision, more than one vote, one congressional term, or Presidential election. Ours is a struggle of a lifetime, and that is why we must not get lost in a sea of despair, Mr. Speaker. We must not lose faith in a dream of an integrated society promised by the Brown decision.

Here, in the United States Congress, we must hold fast to the struggle for peace, the struggle for equality, and the struggle for justice for all, until the dream of a truly interracial democracy is fully realized in America, until we see the dawn of the beloved community, a Nation at peace with itself.

We cannot be satisfied, we cannot rest until that day comes, until the true meaning of Brown is a living reality for all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

PERSECUTION OF HINDUS IN BANGLADESH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to express my deep concern over the persecution of Hindus in Bangladesh. The coalition government of the Bangladesh Nationalist Party, BNP, which came to power on October 1, 2001, has initiated a violent campaign. And since the BNP's parliamentary victory nearly 3 years ago, a campaign of terrorism, murder, and religious cleansing has been unleashed on Hindus living in Bangladesh. I had written a letter to Bangladesh's Prime Minister Zia in 2002 about this violent persecution, but I have received no response to date; and it is a fact that unabashed violence has continued freely.

Although the latest wave of violence has been ensuing since the BNP took power in 2001, Hindus have been a disappearing minority in Bangladesh at the hands of Bangladeshi forces that have employed human rights abuses, atrocities, and ethno-religious cleansing tools. In 1941, Hindus comprised 28 percent of the population; but by 1991, the Hindu population dwindled to a meager 8 percent. A large part of this decrease in the Hindu population can be attributed to the 1971 genocide by the then-Muslim East Pakistan Party, whereby 2.5 million Hindus were murdered and 10 million Hindus fled to India as refugees.

Reminiscent of the Jewish Holocaust, Hindu homes were marked by a yellow H, which in fact guided the pillagers to their homes. Over the following 30 years, thousands of Hindu temples were destroyed, Hindus were systematically disenfranchised from holding political power, and prejudicial legislation ensured an unstable existence for Hindus. In fact, Islamic extremists have routinely dispossessed Hindus and, for that matter, Christians and Buddhists, of their ancestral properties and land, burned down their homes, and desecrated and razed temples, which has resulted in forcing many to flee as refugees.

Mr. Speaker, I have reviewed numerous reports that attest to the current violent persecution in Bangladesh. These reports have been written by the International Federation of Bangladeshi Hindus and Friends, Amnesty International, the U.S. State Department's Annual Report on International Religious Freedom, CNN, BBC, and multiple Bangladeshi newspapers that reflect the testimonies of the Hindu victims.

This campaign of minority cleansing in progress in Bangladesh has to be stopped. Since 1971, when Bangladesh was born as a secular democratic country out of Islamic Pakistan, all minority populations have declined, and this Islamization must be put to an end through the government's leadership. In an effort to uphold pluralistic democracy in Bangladesh and protection

of Hindus and all minorities, the following must be implemented:

□ 1945

First, restoration of secularism in the constitution of Bangladesh, as it existed in the first constitution of independent Bangladesh in 1972.

Second, passage of affirmative action and hate crime laws that acknowledge the minority communities of Bangladesh.

Third, production of a white paper on atrocities against the minorities over the years, and assurance that the perpetrators of the ongoing pogrom are brought to justice.

Fourth, repatriation of the refugees, displaced people, with full compensation to the victims.

Fifth, ending of oppression of journalists and writers who report minority and human rights violations.

Six, termination of the illegal torture in custody of members of secular parties.

And seventh, allowance of an independent commission to investigate the atrocities perpetrated against the minority groups.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that these goals can be achieved and the Government of Bangladesh can take the necessary steps to international human and civil rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REFLECTIONS ON BROWN v. BOARD OF EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 50th anniversary of the Supreme Court's landmark decision to end segregation as the law of the land. This day, in short, changed everything or almost everything in the field of race relations. This day was Monday, May 17, 1954.

Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka was about more than Topeka, Kansas. It was, in fact, a consolidation of five cases challenging segregation in public schools in the United States of America. The five cases had been heard by lower courts and had been appealed to the United States Supreme Court by attorneys representing black school children in South Carolina, Washington, D.C., Delaware, Virginia, and Topeka.

Today, we celebrate the fortitude, the integrity, and the conscience of those who stood up for American values, from the 1930s and 1940s with the Mexican neighbors in Lemon Grove and the Mendez family in Orange County, California, to the 1950s with the students of Robert Moton High School in Virginia, parents in Washington, D.C., Summerton, South Carolina, Delaware, and, yes, the Brown family of Topeka, Kansas.

In communities across the Nation, minority families united to make America's promise of equality apply to their children, too. Brown was a turning point in the battle for equal educational opportunities for all, but there is still a long way to go before we can declare victory.

Although the Supreme Court handed down its decision 50 years ago, we must not forget that Brown is not only a historical moment, but it is living law. We must rededicate ourselves to keeping the spirit of Brown alive in every State, every school district, and every school building in the country. More than 40 percent of the 1.8 million Hispanic students in Texas attend schools where they are the overwhelming majority. Texas is not the only State seeing this trend.

Across the United States, communities are increasingly isolated by race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status. Our schools reflect this isolation. Today, in 2004, Hispanic students attend the most segregated schools in the Nation.

Wealth is concentrated in certain communities and because of our system of funding schools with local property taxes, that wealth is also concentrated in certain schools. Nearly every State in the Union is engaged in court battles over school finance. It seems to me that equal opportunities and equal resources go hand in hand; do you not agree?

It is no coincidence that the Texas miracle in education followed the implementation of the so-called Robin Hood system of funding schools that moved resources from wealthier school districts to poorer ones.

In staying true to the spirit of the Brown decision, we must ensure that

America's young people have equal opportunities and that the resources to achieve them are provided, no matter what the color of their skin, no matter what their ethnic background is, no matter if they are poor, and no matter where they live in the United States, whether it be in the metropolitan cities or rural areas.

Today, the unfortunate truth is, not only have we not fulfilled the dream of equal educational opportunities, but also many of our young people are not even in "separate but unequal schools." Many are completely separated from school altogether.

The graduation rate for African American and Hispanic students hovers at 50 percent. The Manhattan Institute reports that only 20 percent of the African American students and only 16 percent of Hispanic students leave high school prepared for college. The high school diploma is the minimum entry requirement for postsecondary education and being able to compete in the 21st century workplace. Yet half of our poor and minority students are being denied the basic ticket to a productive future. The spirit of Brown demands that we take immediate action to improve high schools and graduation rates.

We must focus on fundamentals. We must work to improve the basic literacy skills of our secondary school students.

We must support reforms, which have proven effective in improving educational outcomes at the secondary school level. More importantly, we must adequately fund these programs instead of penalizing schools that desperately need our help.

Finally, we must hold ourselves accountable for high school graduation rates. Representative SUSAN DAVIS and I have introduced H.R. 3085, the Graduation for All Act, and Senator PATTY MURRAY has introduced S. 1554, the Pathways for All Students to Succeed Act to support these kinds of reforms.

A coordinated national campaign to improve secondary schools is desperately needed. This campaign must leverage resources from all stakeholders: school districts, local governments, states, philanthropic organizations, corporation, community-based organizations, and the federal government. Together we will turn this around. Together we will make the promise of the Brown decision a reality for all of our young people. Our future depends on our success in achieving equal educational opportunities for all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MEEKS of New York addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

RECOGNIZING BROWN v. BOARD OF EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to be able to be here to share some thoughts and share my time with the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) concerning Brown v. Board of Education, what it has meant to us as a country, what it has led to, and where we are today. And then I would like to take some time and tie it in with No Child Left Behind, which I think perhaps is the most significant measure we have taken since Brown v. Board of Education to truly educate all of the young people in the world today.

I think most of us recognize by now because of all of the news and publicity that Brown v. Board of Education was decided 50 years ago. A lot of people may not know all of the States involved, but one of them happened to be my State, Delaware. Kansas is most often cited, but it was a decision made in the State of Delaware that first said separate but equal, Plessy v. Ferguson should no longer be the law of the land, but indeed we had to have integration in our schools, not just separate but equal facilities; and quite frankly, most of the facilities were not equal anyhow.

From that went the Supreme Court decision argued by Thurgood Marshall and others in which the case of Brown v. Board of Education actually found that the doctrine of separate but equal was unconstitutional in the sense it did not give everyone equal opportunity, and came forward with the new policy of full integration for everybody.

At the time it caused, frankly, some upheaval. Some were disturbed about it. Others embraced it as a solution to a lot of societal and educational problems in the United States of America. But the bottom line was that it was the law of the land. The law of the land, however, does not necessarily mean that it was carried out in that way, because even though that was the way it was stated, there were only a minimal number of students that came forward, often with a lot of publicity, police sometimes accompanying them as they went into their schools. And, indeed, some took advantage of it, but many did not.

In Delaware, other things happened later in terms of desegregation suits, bussing issues, and eventually we got to the point of full integration in Delaware, so we became at one point the second most integrated State in the United States of America. Others struggled for a longer time.

There are pockets in this country where integration took place on a sound basis in terms of bringing our schools together, but it was soon realized that all of the goodwill from Brown v. Board of Education would not be realized in full, at least any time soon, so we struggled continuously in terms of educating our young people.

But something else happened which was very interesting. It was Brown v. Board of Education, decided 50 years ago, which really paved the way for a number of other acts which are of extraordinary importance to Americans today. One is the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and then shortly thereafter the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and the Fair Housing Act of 1968. These in combination with Brown v. Board of Education have helped to integrate America to a degree America had not been previously integrated. They are certainly landmark laws and have helped turn the tide of racism which existed in our country prior to that time.

The Supreme Court revisited the ruling in 1955 to resolve some of the difficulties that were involved. As we look back at that segment of what we have done and what we are doing in the year 2004, there is recognition of a couple of things. One is in the Brown v. Board of Education suit, we were dealing primarily with African Americans. In America today, we are dealing with a greater number of minorities than we were before, as well as a greater percentage of minorities, but particularly Hispanic Americans, some Asian Americans, and a whole variety of other minorities who become actual larger numbers in our school districts. So we deal with broader issues as we deal with the questions that were raised by Brown v. Board of Education.

I think there is also a greater realization, decade by decade, maybe not year by year, of the significance of education. As I go through my communities in Delaware, as other Members go through their communities, I think there is an understanding that you can tie education into economic opportunity in America. If we do that, the issue of race, the issues of gender and geographical location, poor income, backgrounds, the various things that have been a problem before seem to melt away if we can educate all of our young people.

I would say, in 2004, there is greater emphasis on educating each and every young person in our community than there has ever been before. So Brown v. Board of Education has not been perhaps the great success that everyone would have liked it to be. We recognize this anniversary; we do not really celebrate it because a celebration would involve pure integration and no problems, and there are still some problems, but it is of overwhelming importance in the history of the United States of America. It has been extremely positive in many ways, and all of us have a responsibility to try to continue it forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), but before I do that, I am going to come back and talk about No Child Left Behind because I am firmly convinced that the only act which has really made the kind of impact difference or can at least make an impact difference similar to what we had in Brown v. Board of Education is No Child Left Behind, and they are very closely tied together.

But I would like to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) who obviously, through his coaching career, has dealt with many, many young people in terms of their educational concerns, as well as being a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce and the vice chairman of my Subcommittee on Education Reform where we deal with kindergarten through 12th grade education, and is someone who knows as much about education and as much about young people in this country as anyone I know.

□ 2000

Mr. OSBORNE. I certainly appreciate the gentleman's leadership on the subcommittee and in the area of education in general. As he mentioned, in the late 1800s, Plessy v. Ferguson set forth the separate but equal doctrine which really codified and legitimized segregation in the schools, and we ended up living with that for about 60 or 70 years. Of course, that was devastating to not only African Americans but all minority groups. The gentleman has done a good job of explaining Brown v. Board of Education in 1954, overturning the separate but equal ruling. Of course, this was a landmark decision that formally ended segregation in the schools.

Yet as the gentleman has also pointed out, inequities in education still remain over this last 50 years, and I guess we are today celebrating the 50th year anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education. Some groups in our schools are still achieving at much higher rates than others. Statistics indicate that in the fourth grade, Caucasian students are performing on achievement tests about 30 percent higher than African American and Hispanic students. This gap obviously is unacceptable. Some of these differences, I believe, are due to socioeconomic factors, but many are differences simply due to inequities and differences in the schooling and the schools that they are attending.

Since 1954, over 300 billion Federal dollars have been spent on education. With that type of expenditure, we would expect to see that achievement gap narrowing rather dramatically and probably disappearing. Yet the academic achievement gap is still persisting. Until just the last couple of years actually in many cases it has widened. Another inequity that I have noticed through my personal experience, the gentleman mentioned that I used to work on a college campus and

I traveled throughout the country. I visited each year annually probably 60 or 70 high schools. Over 36 years in the coaching profession, I probably evaluated hundreds of transcripts. One of the disconcerting things that I ran into was that occasionally I would run across a transcript that by all measures and all standards looked pretty good. The young person graduated from high school, had the right courses, had reasonably good grades; and then you discover that that young person could not read or could not do basic math. Of course, this has become a major problem in terms of the well-being of our country.

Another problem that we ran into quite frequently was simply comparison with other nations. Within the last couple of years, I believe we have had some international tests. The United States ranks 19th out of 21 nations in advanced math and science. Of course, when you attempt to compete on the international scale, it is almost impossible to do well ranking in those areas. Alan Greenspan recently indicated in a hearing before the Committee on Education and the Workforce that we are not producing enough high school and college graduates with technical skills to fill the jobs that we have in this culture. As a result, we are having to import a fairly high number of people to fill these jobs.

All of these things, I think, have made, as the gentleman mentioned, the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act particularly important. Oftentimes we hear this referred to as the President's bill or a Republican bill. I would like to point out that this was a bipartisan bill. I believe that it passed the House with about 90 percent of the Members voting for the bill, and in the Senate it was just about the same way. This was certainly authored by both sides of the aisle.

As my colleague knows, a couple of the major provisions of the act that I think address some of the previously mentioned failings of our educational system are, first of all, accountability on the part of the students. Obviously, the testing in math and science, grades 3 through 8, is critical. It provides some standards, some evaluation because so often we found that students were simply being passed along because they were a certain age or had attended the grade before and had not really mastered the fundamentals. I guess again as a former coach, I knew that if you did not master the basics, the fundamentals, you were not going to go any higher. You were pretty limited in what you could account for.

Then also, of course, the parents many times were deceived because the child would simply be passed along. They would not realize really where that young person ranked in terms of his understanding of basic math and science. These schools also now, of course, are being held accountable. This has caused a great deal of anxiety and discomfort, as I am sure my colleague has heard and run into.

I think one thing that I would like to point out is that the bill does not label schools as failing. It simply says that those schools that are not performing in an adequate way will be given extra resources; and after 3 years of underperforming, a student may transfer from one school to another so they will not be trapped in an underperforming school. The State where I operate most of the time, out in a rural area with small towns, there really are not very many choices. You either are going to go to the local school or no other school at all. We find that most of those schools do a great job.

I would like to mention just three or four other things, and then I will turn it back over to the gentleman from Delaware. I think one element of No Child Left Behind that really addresses some of the issues in *Brown v. Board of Education* has to do with the disaggregation of statistics. We found that many schools on the face of it were doing quite well; and yet when you began to break it down, you began to realize that some of the subgroups, maybe those students who were disabled in some way, or maybe those students from different ethnic minorities, were really not making any progress, but there were enough students in the school that were scoring well to indicate that that school was doing well.

Under No Child Left Behind, the subgroups are required to make adequate progress as well. We think that this will really do some significant things in narrowing those achievement gaps.

Another misconception that I often run into as I travel my district regarding No Child Left Behind is that somehow the Federal Government is not doing an adequate job of funding. There is some debate in terms of the testing and all that type of thing as to whether it is adequately funded. The General Accounting Office indicates that it is. But still I think it is important that we point out that over the last 2 years since No Child Left Behind, the Federal funding has increased by \$9.7 billion, which is a 35 percent increase. When you figure the cost of inflation is maybe 5 or 6 percent over that 2-year period, this is one of the largest bumps in education spending that we have seen in any 2-year period. We feel that certainly the funding has been very adequate.

I think one reason why so many people feel that the Federal Government is not holding their end up on this is that the States have lost so much funding and they have had to cut their spending on education; and even though the Federal Government is increasing, sometimes our increase is not as fast as the States are cutting. Greater flexibility, I think, is an important part of this bill.

Again, I will just address some rural issues which my colleague may not run into as much. We often find in small rural schools that they do not have grant writers, and whatever pots of money they access from the Federal

Government are so small that they are hardly worth going after. In the No Child Left Behind Act, we are able to pool those moneys and use them in useful ways. That has been very helpful. We have also done some things where any school district with less than 600 students is able to qualify for an extra \$20,000 to \$40,000, which really has made a huge difference in those schools.

Then one thing that has been very important to me is the issue of mentoring, because we have seen so much more dysfunction over the years with our young people. When I first started coaching in 1962, I would say that maybe one out of every 10 young people was from a dysfunctional situation. When I ended up my coaching career in 1997, I would say that was pretty close to 50 percent. Roughly one-half of our young people grow up without both biological parents. As a result, many times schools are dealing with problems that parents at one time dealt with. If a child comes to school with a lot of unmet emotional needs, maybe he is being abused at home, maybe he is hungry, whatever, that child is not going to learn very well. We have found that it is very important that you provide a caring adult in that child's life. We have in No Child Left Behind provided some pretty significant resources for mentoring, including children of prisoners. Often a child of a prisoner, his main goal is to do hard time. That cycle has to be broken.

I guess the last comment that I would make is simply something that I think my colleague probably will flesh out a little bit in greater detail, simply that we are beginning to see the achievement gap narrowing a little bit, at least in some areas. That is in a relatively short period of time. That is encouraging. I think, as the gentleman has pointed out, there is definitely a link between the *Brown v. Board of Education* ruling 50 years ago and No Child Left Behind, which was passed in 2001. I think a lot of people may not make that link, but I think, as the gentleman said, that the No Child Left Behind legislation may be the most significant thing in terms of equality in our country since that ruling of *Brown v. Board of Education*.

I appreciate the gentleman having this Special Order tonight, and I thank him for giving me the opportunity to make a couple of comments.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman's insight into this is as helpful as anybody I know in the entire Congress. His comments are highly appreciated. His continuing concern about the young people, the mentoring, the things that he cares so much about I think makes a huge difference in this country. We thank him for all his service.

I would like to just go back a little bit, Mr. Speaker, if I may. I was in State government for a long time, being a State legislator and then a lieutenant governor and a Governor. I always found it was very hard to

change education. Although I felt we really needed to change education, we needed to be more challenging in education, but there are those who felt that the status quo was the way to go. It was hard to get done. It was not Republican or Democrat. It was just very hard to deal with the subject matter of education.

I was invited in December of 2000 to go to Austin, Texas, to meet with the President-elect, who at that point had been declared the President-elect. I sat at a table with him. There were, I guess, four tables in the room and about 40 Members of the House and Senate or Members-to-be of the House and Senate. I remember that the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) was there sitting right next to the President and others were there. During the election, I heard the promises about education, but I did not pay a lot of attention because it is an election, after all, on all sides. But when I sat there, I realized that here is an individual who really does care a lot about education and that maybe I better start listening to exactly and precisely what he was saying.

He started talking about No Child Left Behind. I cannot recall if it was called No Child Left Behind then, but he talked about lifting every student. My recollection from being in State government was that we could never lift every student. We could always prepare the students for the Ivy League schools, we could help some other students, but we never really helped those students who needed help the most. I always felt that we needed to do that in terms of early education, day care, Head Start. Now we have an Early Reading First program. You name it. Parents had to be more involved. A whole lot had to happen in early education. We needed full-day mandatory kindergarten if we could get it. We needed to give those kids that opportunity.

Frankly, it just simply was not happening, and it was a matter of great consternation to me. For the first time in a long time a light went off. I realized that what he is saying really makes some sense. We can really truly challenge in terms of what is happening in education. We had spent \$300 billion on K-12 education since 1965. Yet there was just no really significant academic improvement in the achievement gaps between minorities, particularly African Americans and our Caucasian students and disadvantaged students and the affluent students in general just was not where it should be. We really had to do something about it. We had, frankly, in this country a two-tiered education system, and it is just simply not acceptable.

In fact, according to the most recent national data, by the time African American students reach eighth grade, only 12 percent can read proficiently and only 7 percent are proficient in math. Nationally, the achievement gap between Hispanic and Caucasian fourth

graders is 29 percentage points. Those are deplorable statistics. They simply are unacceptable.

And No Child Left Behind came along. As the gentleman from Nebraska said, there are a lot of things in there that make a difference, but one of them is this, that is, that each individual would be put into a subgroup of one kind or another. If you have a subgroup of, in Delaware's case, 40; I think it is 35 in other States, individuals in that subgroup, be they low-income, African American, Hispanic American, learning disabilities, whatever it may be, that group is going to be rated on its testing. That school is indeed going to be rated as to making adequate yearly progress on the basis of each of those subgroups, and then the school district is going to be rated on all of the schools in that particular district.

□ 2015

So, as a result, you had a circumstance in which literally everybody was going to be looked at in terms of their educational process. It is obviously much more complicated than that, but that was the basic thesis behind this particular piece of legislation. Indeed, we passed it, as was indicated, by about 90 percent of the House and the Senate, Republicans and Democrats, because we all felt education had to be better.

Well, it has been in place now for a couple of academic years, and indeed there are those who probably were opposed to it to begin with who are still raising questions about, are we spending our money correctly, is there enough money here, is this too demanding on the students, can they take these tests, because it does demand standards and assessments, and that involves testing in grades 3 through 8 and once again after 8th grade, or is this more than these kids can handle, is this really working or not.

But every time I read one of these stories of criticism, Mr. Speaker, I also read about what the various schools are doing to give those kids a better opportunity, and I see hope in that. I see for the first time in many, many generations of educating in America, that we are paying as much attention to the lower income, neediest academic students as we are to everybody else, and we are making special exceptions, and we are looking at various ways in order to really help these children improve from an academic point of view.

So, for that reason, I believe this disaggregation of statistics, breaking it down into subgroups, has made a tremendous difference as far as education is concerned. Yes, there are skeptics, and, yes, it is not easy, and, yes, there are those who would like to overturn it, but the bottom line is, in the lives of some people, it is making a tremendous difference.

Now, as to some of the flexibility issues, as was touched on by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE), I

would like to comment on two or three of those. In the past 6 months, the Department of Education has issued three different rulings that exhibit the inherent flexibility in No Child Left Behind, as well as the Department's willingness to respond when warranted. I would just like to go over these, and they are right here alongside of me.

The first one says under No Child Left Behind being flexible, flexibility on testing students with disabilities. This gets a little bit complicated, but we have essentially opened up the percentage of students that would be exempted from taking the tests, and it is 1 percent, or 10 percent of the students with disabilities in the school, and then the schools can apply for even more if need be, on the basis that not all these kids are in a position to handle the tests. And that has got to be found as to the right chord, so we have the right answer with respect to that, and we will continue to work on that. But the Department has shown some great flexibility.

Second, in February, the Department announced a flexibility policy with respect to how limited English proficient students are included in the school's adequate yearly progress. Really, to make a long story short, we are basically allowing those students to stay in that category for 2 years, so that even after they learn English, it would count in the second year, as well, to help with the scores in that area.

Third, in March, the Department responded to concerns on how to define a highly qualified teacher, still ensuring that every child in America is taught by a teacher who is skilled in his or her subject.

Pretty simple stuff. You want the teachers to be able to teach these subjects that they have studied to the students, and that is basically what the law says. But it also recognizes when you get to certain rural areas and other parts of the country, they may not be able to find teachers who are that specialized, so we have made some exceptions as far as that is concerned.

Then, finally, in late March, the Department issued a flexibility policy for how schools calculate student participation rates, which had to be 95 percent, when determining adequate yearly progress, again liberalizing that slightly in order to meet what we have to do.

It is also important to understand that each State has submitted a plan. I am very proud of my State of Delaware. I think they have submitted both a good plan, and they are looking at revising the plan to improve it based on 1 year's experience.

That is exactly what should be done, because we do need to get all of this in sync between the Federal Government and the State governments with respect to the planning, if we are going to be able to move ahead.

So I feel that No Child Left Behind has been a tremendous adjunct to Brown v. Board of Education for all of these reasons.

The funding issues have been raised by a number of individuals, and I need to share some of that information here, Mr. Speaker, if I may, because, and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) said this, the funding has been well done as far as the Federal Government is concerned. The problem lies more at the State and local levels, simply because they do not have the money they need at this point. I understand that. That will probably come back.

But this shows the funding for programs under the No Child Left Behind Act has an increase of 42.5 percent in 4 years. That is over 10 percent a year. Some States vary. My State happens to have a little more than that percentage, so it does vary a great deal.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, Federal funding for these programs encompassed by No Child Left Behind has risen from \$17.4 billion in 2001 to \$24.3 billion; \$17.4 billion to \$24.3, 2001 to 2004, which represents in excess of a 40 percent increase in just 3 years.

Included in this number is funding for Title I, which is a significant part of all of this. You can see by the red lines which we have here how much Title I has gone up since No Child Left Behind passed.

That is basically, for those who do not know, the funding for disadvantaged students and schools. That was increased by more than \$650 million this year, for an increase of \$3.5 billion, and we have been increasing that on a rapid basis over the past several years, knowing that that money is needed in order to implement No Child Left Behind.

The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. OSBORNE) also pointed out that in certain circumstances, schools can qualify for extra funding. Indeed, if schools have not made adequate yearly progress, then they have the ability to have more flexibility in their Federal funding so they can take money from various other programs, although not Title I, but other programs and move it around, up to 50 percent, in order to help them with their programs as we move forward.

We are beginning to see results. Remember, it has only been in place for 2 academic years. According to a 2004 study by the Council of Great City Schools, the achievement gap is narrowing in both reading and math between African American and Caucasian, and Hispanic and Caucasian students in our Nation's inner-city schools, and they attributed the positive change, in part, to No Child Left Behind; and just last week, Florida and Michigan reported decreases in the achievement gap between African American students and their Caucasian peers.

This is an important day, and we should all honor the anniversary of Brown v. Board of Education and those that were so instrumental in the Brown movement. I have had an opportunity

to meet many of them in the last year and to reflect with them on how far we have gone in ensuring educational access; and yet everyone says that we need to do more to ensure educational success, and that is something we do need to continue to work on.

But, indeed, the ball has started to roll. No Child Left Behind is the next step, which was absolutely essential if we are going to be able to make this work.

Now, for those who would argue that No Child Left Behind is not a step in the right direction, I would ask them to do a couple of things: One, I do not want to really argue with them. I want really for them to study No Child Left Behind, to truly understand what is in there and how they can work it to their advantage.

Secondly, to see what it can do to help a lot of children not being helped otherwise who, I think, for the first time ever, can be helped by No Child Left Behind, to study those individual schools, classrooms and school districts who have understood that and have made a difference as far as No Child Left Behind is concerned, and helping all of those kids, remember, in all those subject groups, particularly the lower-income kids; and then perhaps to look at the funding mechanisms and realize, gee, there is a heck of a lot more money going into education from the Federal Government level than we ever realized. Then they would realize that this truly is a step, is truly a giant step in the right direction, as far as education is concerned, and we must stay that course.

I think any attempts to change this system, to return to the old methodologies or the status quo, would be effectively preserving a system which has not worked as well as it should for all the young people of our country.

America today in 2004 is a true polyglot. We are indeed a country in which people have come in from a variety of other countries. They speak different languages, their color of skin can be different, their religions can be different, their educational opportunities historically in their families may be different.

But we have a responsibility to give them that opportunity in life, which has always been what we have done in America, and we needed to challenge education in order for that to happen. Indeed, I think that Brown v. Board of Education was a challenge, and a welcome challenge, but a new challenge was needed, and No Child Left Behind did that. And I believe it is in the interests of our young people, and I believe if we stay the course, if we do this properly, that we will again rise to the top, where we used to be on all educational standards in this world, and not just for those top students, but for each and every student in our schools in America.

So I urge all of us to pay a lot of attention to what we are doing on the Federal, State and local levels, and

make absolutely sure we are doing all we can to help the children of America.

CELEBRATING THE DEDICATION OF THE NATIONAL WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, let me say what a rare privilege it is to come to the floor this evening to talk about this coming Memorial Day weekend, particularly on May 29 when we as a Nation will not only celebrate Memorial Day, but the dedication of the World War II Memorial on our Nation's Mall of Democracy.

This evening, I would like to talk a little bit about the history of that memorial, how it happened, and refer in particular to a brand new book that has just come out called "Their Last Battle," by Dr. Nicolaus Mills from Sarah Lawrence College, which so well documents the history of this memorial's construction.

When we think about the memorial, obviously it is to the most unselfish generation America has ever known. And if we think back to our own history, the location of this memorial at the center of our Mall of Democracy, between the Washington Monument, which represents the founding of our Republic and George Washington as our first President in the 18th century, and then on the other side, close to the Potomac River, the Lincoln Memorial, representing the preservation of our union in the 19th century and President Abraham Lincoln, and then this memorial, representing the most important achievement of the 20th century, the victory of liberty over tyranny in a just war.

The World War II generation is one that never asked for anything for itself. There are those that asked, well, why was a memorial not built before? It was simply because they would never ask anything for themselves. It was up to the baby-boom generation, people like myself, who were not even born during that period of time, to say, thank you, a grateful Nation remembers.

The sad part of this memorial's unveiling and formal dedication in about a week-and-a-half is that of the 16 million Americans who served, but 4 million are living. We have tried for so very long, 17 years, to make this memorial a reality, and this book describes the long legislative battle which began in this House for the memorial's construction. Indeed, the first 20 pages of "Their Last Battle" would be excellent reading for any history, civics or government class in our country, to understand how hard it is to do something so meritorious.

I would like to tell some of the true story tonight of what actually happened in achieving this great national

monument. In Mr. Mills' book he says at the beginning of the preface, "For centuries to come, the National World War II Memorial, like the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial, will be viewed as a symbol for who we are as a people."

Yes, it will help future generations place the 20th century in proper perspective, with the fulcrum of the 20th century being World War II, what preceded it and what followed it.

The United States, in experiencing the bombing of Pearl Harbor, was really unprepared for war. Our machine tool and steel industries at that point had been deteriorating, and America was not a country that sought to engage itself internationally during that period. But coming out of World War I and a peace treaty that was flawed, with no assistance for the vanquished nations that fell into economic chaos, World War II came slowly, but it resulted from extreme governments rising in places like Nazi Germany and Imperial Japan.

America preferred to remain isolated from the world, and received a rude awakening December 7, 1941. The mobilization that occurred during the last century was something the Nation had never experienced. Sixteen million Americans were called to duty, and that does not count those who served on the home front in war industries, in factories, like our own mother, Sherry Kaptur, who served at Champion Spark Plug making spark plugs that went up into the airplanes, and making sure that the workers in that plant made no mistakes, so that plug did not sputter and a plane would not come down unnecessarily in some far remote place around the world; like our father, Stephen, in the Willys Overland plant, making the Jeep that became known throughout the world during that war.

They were representative of the millions and millions of people that came together in this country, who helped to achieve an allied victory.

□ 2030

I remember growing up as a child and our uncles, Anthony Rogowski, who was a member of the Office of Strategic Services, the OSS, and the Army, flying behind and parachuting behind enemy lines in Burma, in India, in China, the war wounds he brought home with him, the malaria that he experienced throughout his life, being knifed in a fox hole. I remember as a little girl how much his hands would shake when he would get those attacks. And he would tell me, and I was so young and I did not really understand everything he said to me. I remember when he gave me his expert rifleman's pin and tried to understand what his stripes meant and what his promotion rank patches meant.

After his untimely death at age 57, I can remember looking at his flight jacket as an adult, and I thought how small it looks, because when I was a little girl he looked so big to me. And

I remembered his valor and his patriotism. And our uncle Stanley Rogowski, I can remember him not talking about the war very much. I can remember him saying in December of 1944 how he ate frozen K rations in northern Europe after the Battle of the Bulge, having gone through that, climbing over the dead bodies over the cliffs of Dover and then moving into the campaign across northern Europe into Belgium, and ultimately moving down in the Push to Paris to free France.

It was not until a few months before his death in the early 1990s that he came to me in our kitchen at our family home in Ohio. He handed me a religious medallion, a scapular, and he said, Marcy, if anything happens to me, this has always been with me, just make sure I have it.

I kind of looked at him quizzically. I was in the Congress then. He seemed to be okay. He seemed to be doing well, but six months later he died. That was the Sacred Heart Medal he kept with him from the time he left the States as an infantry man in the U.S. Army until he died.

I mention those stories because back in 1987 when another Army veteran, Roger Durbin from the Buckeye State of Ohio, shouted across the room at me in a place called Jerusalem Township, Ohio, where the annual Lucas County Township Trustees banquet was being held, their annual dinner. I was walking across the room, and I heard a voice say, Congresswoman KAPTUR, why is there no World War II memorial in Washington where I can take my grandchildren? I remember turning around saying, Who is talking to me? And I saw this man way across the room, and he had a grin on his face. His eyes were twinkling and he had gray hair, and he was standing very sturdily there. There were hundreds of people at this banquet, and they were all paying attention. And I said, Well, sir, I think there is a memorial. He goes, Oh, yeah, what is it? And I said, Well, sir, I think it is Iwo Jima. And he said to me, Wrong. That is to one service in one campaign. Congresswoman, there is no World War II memorial in Washington where I can bring my grandchildren.

I walked up to him and then began a very long friendship with Roger Durbin of Berkey, Ohio, population, I think it is about 265. And we began an effort over many, many years to build this memorial. I thought it would be easy. I am told by the historians at the Smithsonian that actually we have achieved the construction of this major memorial in much shorter time than the other memorials, the Lincoln Memorial, the Washington Monument, and many of the other monuments in this city.

This one is particularly significant in its placement and its meaning. I felt we could have gotten it completed by the 50th anniversary of allied victory, which would have been 1995. But by 1995 we had only achieved the passage of two related bills to create the memo-

rial and to fund the first several million dollars of architectural and engineering plans through the sale of memorial coins. And I want to thank President George Herbert Walker Bush who signed the first bill for the memorial and President Bill Clinton who signed the second bill after three separate Congresses had labored to pass those pieces of legislation, and it was not easy.

There were many delays. There were many questions during that early period. And I want to place on the record this evening my deep appreciation to Congressman Sonny Montgomery of Mississippi who is retired now, but who helped us so much; Congressman Bob Stump of Arizona, who unfortunately passed recently. I also want to thank Congressman Bill Clay of Missouri, who has retired now; Congressman Henry Gonzales of Texas, who has passed. His son serves here from Texas, San Antonio. I want to thank Congressman Esteban Torres, who helped us a great deal on the banking committee in those days, helped pass those coin bills. And also from the other body, I want to thank Senator John Glenn, now retired; and Senator Strom Thurmond, who has passed.

There were so many people, so many people who helped us, as we struggled up hill to get the 218 signatures on both sides of the aisle; and we did try to make it a bipartisan effort. And I also want to thank all of those people in the agencies, in the American Battle Monuments Commission, the Department of Interior, Park Service, those who helped us move the idea to the point where we can now present to the Nation.

Being a Buckeye from the State of Ohio, we are particularly proud that this idea was Buckeye-born and Buckeye-led. And in about a week and a half it will be turned to the Nation for history. Now, Mr. Durbin never said to me, I want this for our generation. He only said, he said he wanted it for his grandchildren so he could bring them to a place and show them the causes for which he had fought, and what he and his wife, Mary, and what their lives had been about.

I thought it was very coincidental, and I said a little bit earlier today, somewhat providential that when the plaza at the memorial was opened a few weeks ago, the very first group through was an Ohio group of students from Jones Junior High School in Toledo, Ohio. They were there early in the morning, and the NBC camera crew with Tim Russert was down there on the site. That was totally unplanned. And I felt Roger's hand in all of that because he would always go out to the children as we were trying to raise money for the memorial, and we would talk to them at the schools, and they would collect pennies, and they would help contribute dollars to this memorial.

It has been so heartwarming to see the children of America appreciate

what their great grandparents did; and that the real strength of this country is in our families, in our memories and what we bring here and we try to have into the fabric of America for the present and for the future; and surely this memorial does that.

There is a section of this book by Mr. Mills that says the following: "At the graveside of Roger Durbin that he had chosen for himself and his wife at Wolfinger Cemetery just a few miles from their home, Mr. Durbin would however leave behind a reminder of how he wanted to be remembered and how so much of what he did in the last decade of his life depended on memories that nothing could change. There at the Durbin graveside chiseled on a blue granite tombstone would be list rank, Tech 4 U.S. Army, his birth and death dates, April 18, 1920 to February 2, 2000; and the distinct lightening bolt and tank tread insignia of the Tenth Armored Tiger Division."

I can remember back in 1995, Veterans Day, when Roger and I stood on the site where the memorial will be dedicated and we broke ground. And we literally dedicated that site initially, and soil was brought from 16 U.S. cemeteries around the world plus Arlington and placed there. And a flag at that the time was hoisted and was ultimately folded, and President Clinton then presented the flag to Roger Durbin. And Roger turned from the crowd and he began to weep. And he said to his wife, Marion, Marion, I want to be buried with this flag.

And I can tell you for history's sake that Roger was buried with that flag in the year 2000. He had wanted nothing more than to be with us this coming Memorial Day weekend to see this actually happen and to see this dream come true for all of America's grandchildren. But he somehow knew at the end that he would not make it until this point.

He called me over to his house about 2 weeks before his death in the year of 2000, and he had a rendition of the memorial above his fireplace. He said, Marcy, come here. I want to show you something. He took me to another room, and he was suffering from pancreatic cancer at that time. And he took me into his private room and he showed me all the furniture that he and his wife, Marion, had inherited from their parents and grandparents, beautiful cherry furniture. Then he pulled from under the bed a big box. It was kind of like a foot locker, and he opened it up and he took out this scrapbook. He said, Marcy, I want you to know about this in case something happens. And I said, Roger, what is that exactly? I started paging through a carefully kept diary, page by page in see-through pages, plastic pages where each letter, each bill, each news story, each letter was catalogued and documented.

He was a letter carrier after coming home from the service, and it was meticulously kept. And I know what a

treasury those scrapbooks are to the Nation. They really belong in the National Archives. But Roger did not want them to go astray or be misfiled or mishandled in any way. But what a patriot. And what a citizen. He understood the importance of history and of marking history and of explaining history. And he is someone whose education was stolen from him. He could have had a Ph.D., yet he was called off to war and he had to interrupt his life when he came back. Obviously, there were adjustment issues as any battle-scarred veteran well knows, but he did all of this.

This construction of the memorial became a last calling for him in the last years of his life. And I just feel so privileged as a member of the baby boom generation, knowing the history of our family and all of the people from our country knowing the sacrifices that they have made, to have been a part of this, to have been able to be a real representative which is the way that our government should work, to take this idea from the people, to bring it here, and to make it happen and to give it to the future.

When we think about the World War II generation and that war, its causes, a world that politically could no longer hold, an extremism rising from the chaos that World War I had bequeathed to the future, and no group of political leaders internationally able enough to put the pieces back together. And then this horrendous war in which 70 million military participated from all of the allied nations and 17 million people died, 17 million; 406,000 people from our country died.

At this memorial there is a wall of remembrance with gold stars representing each 100 that died. And when you look at the wall, those stars are then reflected in the fountain and pool. In essence, you see a reflection so each star really represents every 50 that died. And over 800,000 injured just in this country. Then when you think of those that perished globally, over 50 million people died.

Historians are just beginning to tell us that inside the Soviet Union under the horrendous dictatorship of Joseph Stalin, 50 million people died just there. So I think that the numbers will increase as history begins to accurately count as well as it can what happened. But any member of the World War II generation coming from that carnage tried to create a world different than the one that they had lived.

And I guess it is not surprising then that the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was set up, NATO, and became the most important military and strategic alliance globally, where the allied nations bound together in a real partnership and tried to keep the peace. And the major challenge that they faced after World War II was the Soviet Union under a very communist regime for many decades, which at the end of 50 years finally collapsed without a

shot being fired because of the strength of NATO and their understanding of containment and of allied unity.

□ 2045

That was something that Mr. Durbin's generation gave to us; and then following World War II, unlike World War I, the Marshall Plan and George Marshall coming before a university audience and in a 12-minute speech, not a 25-minute or hour speech, a 12-minute speech declaring that there would be a Marshall Plan to rebuild the vanquished nations, unlike after World War I when the vanquished nations were left to fall and, from within that chaos, these extremist governments rising. So the Marshall Plan.

Then the importance of allied unity, a real alliance, a transatlantic alliance that has held until the present day, our great friends in Germany, in France, in all of Western Europe and the broadened alliance with the new nations, newly freed nations, Hungary, Poland and so forth.

Then the United Nations. Not a perfect creation, but a place where dialogue could occur in order that the carnage that Mr. Durbin and the World War II generation faced just might not happen again, trying to build the creation of the World Bank, world institutions to handle currency exchanges. They tried so hard to shape institutions so that what they had suffered would not be foisted on the world again. We have so much to learn from them.

So a week and a half from now, when we dedicate this memorial to the World War II generation and to all they built abroad and at home, we have so much to learn.

We think about the post-World War II era when they came back home and the GI bill created the financing for home ownership, and ordinary families were able to, for the first time, really own a piece of the rock; and in 1952, President Harry Truman integrating the military in deep appreciation to those citizens of color who had fought two wars during those World War II war years. They fought the military battle, but then they fought the social battle, the civil rights battle, to gain full recognition and full appreciation for their service to our country, which President Truman then finally acknowledged.

Women's rights growing out of the victory of World War II, women working in the plants, displacing those men who had been called to service, and women working outside the home becoming nationally accepted behavior, very different from before World War II. Women in the service, as well as women in the nursing corps, helping to establish a platform for themselves and be accepted in the world of employment in the way that they had never been before.

In Mr. Mills' book, in the very last chapter, and I would just like to end by reading this this evening, he says: "For

an America that in the wake of the September 11 attacks has felt threatened to a degree unknown in this country since the bombing of Pearl Harbor, such homage is more than just a final tribute to a parting generation. It is also an act of self-preservation, a way of reminding ourselves of our ability as a Nation to come together in a crisis and, by extension, a way of linking ourselves with a generation that dealt successfully with years of crisis. 'Earn it,' says a dying John Miller, the Army captain played by Tom Hanks in "Saving Private Ryan," to the young Private Ryan, whom he and his squad have found at great cost to themselves so that Ryan may leave the war and return to his mother, who has already lost three sons in battle."

"Earn it," he says.

Fifty-nine years later, the National World War II Memorial has become one more way of "earning it," of acknowledging all that has been made possible by the sacrifices of the World War II generation. And on Memorial Day and the May 29 weekend, and in a ceremony to be held this Thursday here in the Capitol in Statuary Hall, there will be two handmade United States flags that have been made in the State of Ohio in our home district, the 9th Congressional District, and the headers on those flags read as follows: Made in Lucas County, Ohio, U.S.A. A grateful Nation remembers.

We have the letters of the two public laws that were passed in order to make the memorial a reality, and then there is the ruptured duck logo that every World War II veteran received upon discharge. The threads in the 17th star on that flag include threads from the sewing basket of Marian Durbin, the wife of Roger Durbin, as well as from our family, as well as from the home post of Roger Durbin, the Dean Post in Lucas County, Ohio, as well as from many of the women in the Embroidery Club of Northwest Ohio, whose parents participated in the war. That 17th star, because it is the Ohio star, is embossed just a bit, all according to regulation.

One of the flags, upon completion and having been flown over every county in the 9th District, was flown around the world to every cemetery where we have U.S. troops buried or commemorated as missing in action. The very last stop was Manila, Philippines, before it was brought back home here to Arlington and flown, and it will be here in the Capitol for this Thursday's ceremony.

The other flag remained stateside and worked its way to the Ohio State capitol and was flown over the capitol, and now has been brought here to the Nation's Capitol for official hoisting this Thursday.

When we do this, one of the flags will be flown in honor of our World War II veterans who are still serving in this Congress, including the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), whose seniority numbers one here in the House; the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON); the gentleman from

Illinois (Mr. HYDE); the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL); the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA); and I believe the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS).

So we pay tribute to those among us, as well as to those who have passed in service to our Nation. We remember them all, and we thank all the World War II veterans.

We thank Senator Bob Dole who has chaired the fund-raising committee for this memorial, for championing these efforts so that the funds were raised privately. It is so important to remember that of all of the contributions, nearly \$190 million has been raised mainly from private contributions, from individuals, from school children, from fraternal organizations, from veterans organizations.

Our States have contributed dollars to the construction of the memorial, many private companies, many small businesses. I think in the State of Ohio the largest association that made a contribution were funeral directors, the Funeral Directors Association of the State of Ohio. Across our country, including school children, thousands and thousands and thousands of children have made this memorial possible, and there can be no finer tribute to America's most unselfish and greatest generation than the love and remembrance of those grandchildren.

WORLD WAR II MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, let me first identify myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) whose very eloquent and heartfelt remarks certainly touched our hearts, and her actions and her activity and all of the diligence that she has put into this, and the hard work and commitment she has put into this project is to be commended. There are those of us that stand in awe of the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and all the work she has done for this generation.

I take it as a personal favor to my family that the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) has been doing this because my father, of course, is part of that generation, and everything she said about those brave men and women applies to my father, who served in the Marine Corps during the Second World War and who left a poverty-stricken-type of family background in North Dakota to walk off, save the world, save the world from the dread and the tyranny of Japanese militarism and Naziism. Certainly this heroism is something that we owe such a great deal to.

So, Mr. Speaker, tonight first let me tip my hat to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) and those who put such a lot of work into this project.

ILLEGAL ALIEN INVASION

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, let me just note that the person who alerted me to the subject I will talk about tonight was a World War II veteran. His name was Frank Casado, a very proud Mexican American, who owned and built Lucy's Restaurant in Los Angeles. Frank later became very politically active. He was a Democrat, I might add, but he was a very close friend, and I would go to his restaurant as a young reporter and then as I worked in Ronald Reagan's staff in the White House; and Frank would always pull me aside and say, "Dana, you have got to do something about the illegal alien invasion of our country. You have got to do something about it." If there ever was an American of Mexican descent it was Frank Casado.

Frank joined the Navy in World War II, and he always prided himself that he had been on the boxing team and been one of the contenders of the championship of the fleet, and he was a very, very proud man. He was proud of his Mexican heritage as well, but he knew that the flood of illegal immigrants into our country was bound to bring us down, and if we can do anything to keep faith with those veterans who have sacrificed so much for our country over the years, it is that we should have the courage to face the issue of illegal immigration and to deal with it, to understand that those people who fought and died in World War II and have sacrificed over the years for our country to create this wonderful country of ours, they would be appalled to know that we are afraid to discuss the issue of illegal immigration, afraid to discuss the issue that perhaps is the greatest threat to America's well-being today, and that is an onslaught, an uncontrolled invasion of, yes, good people but people who will have a dramatic impact, negative impact on the American way of life. They did not give their lives in order to make sure that this country could be taken over by anyone who would thwart our laws and basically massively come into our country illegally.

We need to have the courage to face the issue. Frank Casado, as I said, first alerted me to how this major influx of illegal immigration was changing the nature of California as he knew it and as he grew up, because he was a native Californian. He was a man who grew up in Los Angeles and described for me how this massive influx of illegal immigrants was bringing down the people of his community. People who should have been on the upward path instead were being brought down by a flood, an uncontrolled flood of illegal immigration.

Let us keep faith with those people who defended this country and won our freedom and wanted us to live in a high standard of living and wanted our people to have a good country. Let us keep faith with them.

□ 2100

And certainly let us not do one thing, let us not permit the benefits that we give to illegal aliens to have a negative impact on these very same senior citizens, these very same soldiers, whether defeated Hitler or Tojo.

In fact, today we have a very limited amount of health care dollars. At a time when our economy is moving forward, but not as strong as it was, let us say 10 years ago, we need to make sure that every dollar counts. Because if a dollar is not spent most wisely, the people most affected will be our senior citizens and also will be our children. And so, today, I plead a case for these seniors and these children. Let us not dissipate the funds that are available to take care of our seniors and our children in order to provide services for illegal immigrants who have come here thumbing their nose at our law and blatantly and arrogantly breaking the law to come here.

And, yes, these are generally honest, good people, coming here to improve their lives, but we cannot afford to take care of all the good people of the world if it means, and it will mean this, that we will have to cut back on what we give to our own citizens.

I rise tonight to alert my colleagues to a vote that will be taken tomorrow on the floor of this Congress, a vote that will mark a turning point for our country or it will reflect a continued unwillingness by America's elected officials to do anything to protect us from what I am calling, what I believe to be the greatest threat to our national security and well-being.

Now, again, what am I talking about when I say that? Tomorrow morning, there will be a vote on legislation that I have offered, H.R. 3722, which will attempt to protect us from a major decline in our quality of life and a decline in quality, I might add, of the health care we have for our seniors and our children due to the uncontrolled onslaught of illegal immigrants into our country and into our hospitals and into our emergency rooms.

If left unchecked, illegal immigration will destroy everything which those World War II veterans were fighting for: a decent quality of life for our people, a government that is reflective of our values, and a country in which we can take care of those who are in need because they are people of our communities and of our States and of our country who have also served our country, whether they be Mexican Americans, like Frank Casado, or black Americans, or Caucasian Americans, or Asian Americans.

We have a country of rich diversity, but all of us need to stick together and care about each other more than we need to care about people who would come into our country illegally and dissipate the funds that are needed for these other Americans and even our own families to get the education and health care that they need.

It is unforgivable that our government has refused to act when the evi-

dence is so clear. Millions of people are being permitted to get into our country and then to stay in our country illegally. And this is having an horrendous impact on our standard of living, on safety in our country, and on the quality of life of average Americans.

For tens of millions of Americans and local and legal residents, real wages have stagnated over the last 15 years. We have seen a major increase in our standard of living and in the statistics that indicate how much wealth our country is worth; yet we have a huge number of people, citizens and legal residents, who live here and have not seen their standard of living increase. In fact, they see all the time little indications that their quality of life is going down, whether it is the fact they cannot afford to buy tires for the family car, or their children cannot afford to buy a home, so they have to stay at home now because they cannot afford to get a house of their own, or the fact that their kids are not expecting really to have a good job. They see these indications that something is happening to our country, where the middle class and working class people are not living as well as they did before and, in fact, have been cut out of this huge increase in the wealth that has taken place in our society of these last 2 decades.

Well, the answer is very clear. The factor that is intervening is a massive flow of illegal immigration that is undercutting the ability of our own people to have good-paying jobs because we are holding wages down with an influx of illegal immigrants. And we are also taxing all of the services provided to our people, the people who have worked all their life to pay taxes; and sometimes, what is happening is, illegals will come into our country and they will not be paying taxes. They will work at jobs where taxes are not paid, and they will bring their families in to consume those benefits in education, health care, and otherwise that are meant for our own people.

Our education and the education of our children has been undermined. Real wages have stagnated. Our health care resources that are necessary to take care of the health of our people have been depleted and the safety of our streets and neighborhoods, and thus, yes, the safety of our families, has been compromised. This is not a back-burner issue. Illegal immigration and how we solve it, or if we ignore it, will determine what America is going to be like tomorrow.

This deals with a crisis of today. It seems to me that we have political people here whose only real goal is to prevent a crisis of the moment. Let us not have a crisis now; let us put that off. Well, I say, no, we need to deal with the threats to our country, just the way the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) was speaking about the threats to the world and to our country that loomed there 50 years and 60 years ago when Hitler and Tojo threatened the world. That generation, the Great-

est Generation, did not turn its back and simply say let us try to find a compromise and it will go away. They understood that unless something was done, unless the issue was looked at with courage and with conviction that the United States would cease to be the country that they had inherited from their families and their parents.

So, today, this attitude of elected officials that we should do anything to get away from confronting this issue, let us not have a crisis today, let us not have a confrontation on it today, this works totally contrary to the tradition that we have had that has kept our country free and prosperous. Elected officials have basically remained silent about illegal immigration. Every poll that I have seen, and I include the polls of Americans of Mexican descent, indicates that the vast majority of our people are angry and upset with the fact that illegal immigration is permitted to go uncontrolled and that illegal immigrants are pouring into our neighborhoods and destroying our way of life and the quality of life and the possibility for better jobs for a whole segment of our population. The American people are angry that their elected officials refuse to deal with this issue.

The American people need to ask themselves: Why is it, why is it that elected officials refuse to even think about confronting illegal immigration? Well, a large number of American people, as we know, are deeply troubled and enormously concerned about the onslaught of this massive flow of illegal immigration in the United States. So why are our officials not acting?

First and foremost, I believe that many elected officials have been intimidated from addressing this burning issue. Now, when I say intimidated, what does that mean? Today, in the debate on my bill, 3722, which we will talk about later, one of the Members came forward and said this represents mean-spiritedness. And, of course, that means racism. That is a little catch phrase for racism. And also I was pulled aside by several people after the debate, oh, you should not bring this up, because they think this is a racist attack.

Racism. The elected officials of the people of the United States are afraid to be called racist. They are afraid to be called mean spirited. Well, I can be intimidated in a number of ways, but I can tell you it means a gun or a knife. They can call me all the names they want, but I am confident in my own heart that I am dealing with this issue and other issues based on a love for humanity; and more than that, and I will admit this, a love for the people of the United States of America, in gratitude for the contributions and the sacrifices that people like those people in the Greatest Generation, people like my father and the others the gentlewoman from Ohio was talking about. The sacrifices they made give me strength and give me the willingness to know that I am trying to do things that are positive.

And I will not be intimidated because people are willing to call me, and try to use the tactic of calling me and others, a racist. I will tell you this, the label of racist and hatemonger has caused fear throughout Republican ranks. The liberal left knows this, and they constantly try to play that card. It is time for the American people to totally reject this type of racism in and of itself, the people who bring up racism in order to defend policies that should be discussed on the merit.

Unfortunately, as I say, when someone says you are a hatemonger, most Republicans just wither away because they are afraid to be called hatemongers. They basically know, as I do, that most illegal immigrants, if not all illegal immigrants, are wonderful people. Ninety-five percent, let us say, or ninety-nine percent of illegal immigrants who come to this country are wonderful people. But this is not a debate about whether illegal immigrants are themselves bad people. We can care about them. They are probably good people. And we can care about the rest of the world. But that does not mean that we have infinite resources here in the United States so that we can provide benefits and goods and services and a place to stay for anybody in the world who can make it to the United States.

If we try to do that, if we are cowed from discussing the issue because we are afraid to be called racist because we know we have to draw a line somewhere or it is bound to bring our people down, if we keep doing that, what is going to happen is that our citizens are going to experience a major decrease in their standard of living. A threshold will be reached and the American taxpayer will be spending more and more, and yet our citizens will actually be living lives that are not as high in quality and filled with opportunity as when the tax rates were even lower.

It is not hateful nor is it being racist to use scarce resources, like the amount of tax money we have, the amount of health care dollars we have, the amount of education dollars we have; it is not a racist thing to say we are going to provide for our own people first, realizing that our own people come from every race and every religion and every ethnic group. That is what makes us so proud to be Americans. But if we do not think of our own citizens first, then we have abandoned the one thing that ties our Nation together, and it is a feeling of love and solidarity with all other Americans.

Let me say that I believe even if we take this down to the family level, and we say some family that works hard, saves their money, and spends their money that they have saved on their own family, on their children and on perhaps their father and mother, are these people actually filled with hate, are they hatemongers, do they deserve to be called that simply because they refuse to spend money on the needy people down the street rather than on

their children's education or health care? Well, I believe that it is not hateful. It is not negative to try to take care of your family first. And no one should apologize that that is the policy of our government or that that should be the policy of our government, which is what we are advocating today.

That does not mean you do not care about your neighbors or that you do not care about the neighbors down the street. But first and foremost caring for your family is in and of itself an act of charity and love. And let us never forget that charity begins at home. And for us to be giving away the limited dollars available for health care in this country to people who have come here illegally, and taking the money away from that pool of money that should be going to our own citizens, our own children, our own senior citizens, to that great generation that the gentlewoman from Ohio talked about it, is sinful. It is sinful for us to take it and give it to strangers, many of whom have never contributed anything to the country.

Now, yes, some illegal immigrants have contributed, but let me note that many illegal immigrants who come here do not work at jobs where they take the taxes out of their paychecks. Then they bring their families, and so their families are basically being taken care of by the taxes that come out of our pockets, that we gladly gave to take care of our own families and our own fellow citizens, but these other folks who have come here illegally often do not pay any taxes at all.

□ 2115

To make matters worse, the employer that employs them and gives them a job and then pays them under the table more often than not does not give them any health care benefits. Thus, they do not pay taxes, are taking away the benefits, the health care benefits, that should be going to our own people who are paying taxes.

I say this not because I dislike people, but because I do like people from other countries. Our greatest asset is that we are a country that is made up of people of every race and every religion. But I say this, every person who is an American and who is here and conducting him or herself in a legal way and trying to live their life as best they can, these people are part of our American family, and we need to care more about them than we do to take care of someone, even though he might be a good person, or the family that comes from China or Latin America, that we need to take care of our own people first. It has nothing to do with race.

The people that are involved in the United States of America, they are good Americans who come from every race and every religion, but we cannot take care of every wonderful person in the world. If we try to, we will hurt our fellow Americans. We cannot try to do everything for everybody, especially

when we mean everybody in the world, and expect that we will be able to do anything for anybody, and that includes anybody in the United States, because our system will break down.

As Members hear this debate about illegal immigration, whenever we try to draw a line, the other side chastises us for it as if we are being mean-spirited. Where do they draw the line? The Members opposed to H.R. 3722 seem to believe we can give unrestricted and unlimited health care benefits to people who have come here illegally and it will not impact the American way of life or quality of life of our own American people. That seems the height of naivete.

But there are other Members who are not naive at all about this issue. While we are proud of Americans, of every race and religion, these other people have another motive on wanting to have illegal immigrants coming into our country, and it is not just to be benevolent.

But let me get to this issue and that is the idea, and we hear this because it is not just racism that is charged, but those of us who want to do something about illegal immigration, we are being charged with the idea that we are anti-immigrant. I believe around 15 percent of the population are immigrants. They are a sizable force in our communities, and they are doing great things for America, great things.

In fact, one of the things we can be most proud of in the United States is that we permit 1 million immigrants to come here every year, along with 400,000 refugees from many of the horrible spots around the world where people live in total desperation. With a population of 280 million people, I believe we can absorb 1 million immigrants a year along with 400,000 refugees. That is our contribution to the world.

That figure represents more legal immigration into our country than is permitted in all the other countries of the world combined. All of the other countries of the world combined do not permit a million immigrants into their country. But just in the United States, we permit a million people to come here, along with 400,000 refugees.

It has worked well for us because people who come here legally must be healthy, they cannot be bringing diseases into the country, they need to be honest, and they need to be self-supporting or they are not permitted to come in. That is a wonderful thing. I think legal immigration is something we can all be proud of because, of course, Americans are immigrants. We are a nation of immigrants, and proud of it.

In fact, every American immigrated here, and that includes Indian Americans who at one point emigrated from the Siberian tundra when there was some sort of ice bridge between Asia and the New World, so we are all immigrants here. But we have come here to prove that we can show people how to

do things and have a better way of life. We did not come here, however, to take responsibility for the health care and the benefits for everyone in the world.

We have people now who are coming and swarming into the United States above and beyond that million people. There are probably 2 or 3 million illegal immigrants that are coming here every year, but that is just a guess-timate. They are coming here without control, so we have no idea whether they are criminals, whether they are bringing diseases to our country, and perhaps they might be terrorists. Perhaps they want to do us great harm because they identify with Islam or some other faith and hate the United States. Maybe they are coming in as illegal immigrants. We do not know. The fact is by bypassing the legal system, they have thumbed their nose at our law and they are putting us in jeopardy because we do not know.

I want to draw my colleagues' attention to the dire consequences of not stemming the uncontrolled flood of illegal immigrants into our country. Every day tens of thousands more illegals arrive in our country. If they are sick or criminals or they are terrorists, we do not know. This is a catastrophe in the making. It will lead eventually, if left uncontrolled, to a destruction of the American way of life or a major crisis in our country in which our people will suffer greatly.

The American people see what is happening. They know, they can see what is happening in our cities and in our communities throughout the country. The American people are seething with anger, and every poll suggests 60 to 80 percent of the American people are outraged that nothing is being done and their country is being taken away from them by an uncontrolled flow of illegal immigrants from other countries. Where is our courage? Where is our tenacity?

Yes, we stood up to the Japanese empire during World War II and the Nazis and the Communists after that, but now we are going to give our country away to other people who come here illegally thwarting our laws, thumbing their nose at our way of life in order to come here and consume the resources that have been put away by our mothers and fathers, and squander all of the institutions that we have invested in for our own children?

I think the World War II generation, and every time I have spoken to them, they are ashamed that we are not doing anything about illegal immigration, and they give the most support of any segment of our society in the demand to do something about illegal immigration.

Every time it comes to a vote, we can see that the American people do not like and are upset about illegal immigration, and they are upset that their elected officials are not doing anything. Elected officials are blowing smoke in the faces of their constituents. They are refusing to be honest

about this issue, and we need to have an honest discussion between the elected officials of this country and the American people about illegal immigration.

There was a direct vote by the people about 10 years ago, Proposition 187, in California. Every news media was against it. The establishment of California was totally opposed to Proposition 187. It was going to lose. People were being attacked for being racist. And I know I was attacked as a racist skinhead for supporting Proposition 187. Although you could not tell it from the commentators who were saying what a great disaster it was for the Republican Party, no, Proposition 187 passed in a landslide, a landslide even though all of the major interest groups were against it and all of the major media were trying to bring it down.

Even though an overwhelming number of voters voted for Proposition 187, it was portrayed immediately thereafter as a loss and something the Republican Party should really worry about. Let me note that 1994 was the biggest year for Republicans to gain seats than in any other election in my memory.

Let me also note, when we examine the issue of illegal immigrants, that Americans of Mexican American descent like my good friend Frank Casado, they are just like other Americans. They believe that illegal immigration is an evil that is doing great harm to our country, and about 50 percent of the Mexican Americans are with us when we want to make a stand because their children and their homes and their families are the ones suffering the most by the negative impact that goes on, economic impact and elsewhere, when our country ends up flooded by illegals.

So the Mexican American community, however, was told afterwards you have to be against 187. That was drummed into their heads. Even today, examine the polls. The majority of people who are Americans of Mexican descent, people who are citizens or who over the years came here legally, those people are with us. A majority of those people are with us.

Let me note that the gentleman from southern California (Mr. GALLEGLY) has told me over and over again how there are several cities in his congressional district where a majority of their citizens are Americans of Mexican descent, and he is very proud to tell me in those cities Proposition 187 got a very strong showing. It actually won a majority vote in several of those cities. Why is it then that we have conservatives and Republicans who are afraid to lead the charge on this issue and to discuss it openly and bring it up?

Again, they do not want to be called racist, and they do not want to insult their fellow citizens. They actually care about their fellow citizens of Mexican descent, and they are afraid they may be insulting these folks if

they bring up the issue of illegal immigration. That is the guilt trip the news media is putting on these people.

Let me just say that Americans of Mexican descent are with us on this. They do not want their families to suffer from being unable to get higher wages for their children or income earners of their family, or education funds to be totally eaten up or health care funds being dissipated by people who have just come here, whether it is from Mexico or anywhere else. These are great Americans and these are Californians.

We Californians understand that. California is itself a name that suggests a past culture, what we think of as sort of a paradise in California.

□ 2130

It is a Hispanic culture. All of us are proud in California of this Mexican heritage. Before our State was a State, there was a proud Hispanic civilization there. California is based on a mythology of an island where there was always milk and honey, and the fruits were always ripe and ready to be eaten. It was a paradise on Earth. We know that. That came from a mythology that was written out in the Spanish language. We understand that, and we Californians are proud of that. We believe we live in that paradise. Yet we will lose paradise if we do not take those steps that are necessary to maintain the quality of life, not just for the upper middle class and the upper class but for all Californians. Illegal immigration is the greatest threat in California to the quality of life of every one of our citizens and legal residents.

Let me note, they know that we are not hatemongers because we are protecting them. We need to join an alliance of all Americans to solve this problem and to speak frankly about it and not worry about being called names. We Americans must stick together. It is our loyalty that creates one Nation, our loyalty to each other; and if we are going to permit half of our population to suffer because we are giving away the benefits that were paid for by tax dollars to people who have come here illegally at the expense of that other half of our Americans who live with us, then we are committing a very sinful act. We are not caring about our fellow Americans and we are showing our disrespect for them by not trying to ensure that someone from the outside, a stranger, does not come in and take away the health dollars and education dollars they need.

Turning one group of honest citizens against another group of honest citizens in order to keep the flow of illegal immigration into our country has worked to intimidate people, but it is a dishonest tactic. We will hear it over and over again. But I hope that the American people are beginning to fine-tune their hearing and their listening of these arguments so that when people start saying, this is mean-spirited, this is racist, that they will know that that

person is insulting them and trying to get them not to look at the issue of the day. I would alert my colleagues and the American people to pay no attention when they are called names.

The real hatemongers and the racists are the ones who would turn Americans against Americans. They are the ones who do not care about us as a people. We care about each other, and let us demonstrate that. I would suggest today that America is so far down the road towards a disaster that we have got to come to grips with illegal immigration, or there is going to be irreparable damage to our country. Already many of our people are suffering, and sometimes they do not even understand why.

What else besides what I just described, this fear of being called a racist, prevents us from dealing with the illegal immigration issue? There is another factor involved. This is also a powerful factor, but it is not quite as visible as the one I just described. Everyone can see that people on the liberal left are calling other people names. They are calling them racist, et cetera. We can see this effort on the left side of the political spectrum to try to unleash and keep the flow of illegal immigrants coming to our country because they want to use them as pawns, political pawns.

But there is another very powerful factor involved and that is there are some enormously powerful and enormously wealthy forces in our society which are benefiting from the massive flow of illegals into our country. Who am I referring to? I am referring to Big Business. I am referring to corporations and Big Business and all those people who would make a profit by keeping wages down. Keeping wages down. That is what is going on. There are some powerful interests in America suppressing wages so that people who are in the middle class and lower middle class, working people, are finding themselves in a trap rather than finding their own standard of living increasing.

As I say, there is the liberal wing of the Democratic Party who wants to exploit illegal immigration for their own political purposes. They want to use them as pawns. Then we have Big Business in an unholy alliance with the liberal left of the Democratic Party. These people are trying to exploit helpless people who come to our shores, of course in order to make a bigger profit, so they will not have to give health care benefits, so they do not have to pay as much; and in fact, the wages of all their other employees are brought down because other employees know they can always hire some illegal immigrants from China or from Mexico or elsewhere to do these jobs if we will not do them for this minimal salary that they are offering.

These powerful forces obviously do not represent the interests of the American people. First of all, let us note this. It is estimated that if illegal

immigration goes unchecked, everything else being equal, our population in our country will jump from 280 million people today to 420 million people just a few decades from now. 420 million people. Is that in the interest of the people of the United States? Is that the type of increase in the number of people that we feel comfortable with? Along with that, of course, with this huge increase in our population comes a huge increase in the demand on scarce resources, especially those scarce resources: places to live, good housing, good jobs, good health care, good education. If we let illegal immigration continue, we will have in the blink of an eye a half a billion people living in the United States. Is that what we want? Is that what the American people deserve?

If we leave illegal immigration unchecked, with millions of new people coming to this country illegally every year, if that continues, as I say, we are going to have teeming masses. We will have people who are trapped in situations that are totally inconsistent with the vision of the American dream that has motivated the American people for over 200 years now, the opportunity to dream of a place where people can uplift themselves with hard work, a place where every person willing to work can live a dignified life. If we continue to allow this to go unchecked, all of that will disappear. The American dream will disappear. It will disappear in a mass of faces, of people who are unhappy because they do not have the opportunity that their grandparents had. We will look into the faces of people who are angry. The level of hostility in our society will increase. The America that we know and love will cease to exist.

Were we meant to have an underclass of working people who have no hope for a better life? We are beginning to develop that now. We can see it. Because wages are being held down. There is no doubt about who benefits from low wages. The people who own companies, people who want servants, et cetera, these are people who benefit from illegal immigration. Let me add, there are a lot of upper middle income people, people let us say in the top 20 percent and upper income people who have benefited by illegal immigration. Those people should understand that their whole way of life would not exist if it was not for the people who went out and fought the wars and work hard every day and are honest citizens and are willing to stand up for the principles of America that we respect each other's private property and we respect their rights to live their lives.

These wealthy people would not have that if it was not for all these other Americans who were willing to sacrifice and they do not need as much. They just need a clean and decent place to live. They need to know that their children are going to be educated. They need to have some hope in their lives. This will be taken from them unless we

come to grips with a massive flow of people who are coming into this country from every corner of the world and consuming the seed corn necessary to plant the gardens which will give us the food and the benefits and the good life that the American people have worked so hard for.

My dad and mom came from very poverty stricken homes. I used to go there. My dad joined the Marines, but he was there for 20 years. We used to go back to North Dakota in the summers and sometimes in the winters and work on the farm. They were very poor farms. Those people knew that if they worked hard that America had a promise for them. But what about in the future where that promise does not exist because the education level for the children of working-class people, in California we see it, the education level is going down. It is not going down because of anything they have done. It has been going down because our State is being flooded with illegal immigrants, and their children are pouring into the school system, and they cannot even speak their own languages correctly; and thus the teachers are spending all of their time with problem students from other countries whose parents have never paid the price for the education system in the first place. So the working-class families, their children do not get the education they deserve. It is wrong. It is absolutely wrong. We have got to have the courage to face it.

What are we going to say, that every person in the world will be subsidized in their education and their health care and everything else by the American people? Where do you draw the line? If you disagree with what I just said, where do you draw the line? The other side has no answer for that at all except, you are a racist for bringing it up.

Let me note this: we are being told by those captains of industry who are now condemning any effort to try to get illegal immigration under control, we are told that illegal immigrants are taking jobs that Americans just will not take. That is why we have got to let them here, so they can take these jobs that no one else will take. That is not true. The fact is that that is no justification for allowing this massive influx into our country which is bringing down the wages of all of our people. I suggest that Americans are willing to do just about any job, but they are not willing to do any job at the pay level that is being offered.

Yes, if our country was not flooded with illegal immigrants, employers would have to pay more money for the jobs that they need to have done. That is okay. It is a good thing when you have an increasing standard of living or an increasing GNP that working people get their share and that you have higher incomes and that the people are able to own their own home and have a car and treat their kids out to dinner a couple of times a week. That

is okay. But, instead, we are being told, oh, my, we would have to pay them so much money, it would make it impossible. Let us pay 25 cents more for a hamburger if it means that people who work in those shops giving us those hamburgers and that meat have a decent standard of living and can take care of their families.

A good example of what I am talking about and what has happened to our country when we are flooded with illegals who are now living in substandard housing with their whole families and it has sort of brought down the quality of life of whole areas in Southern California, let me mention this. When I went to graduate school, I worked at night as a janitor. Yes, I cleaned toilets and there was nothing wrong with that type of work. Every person who works and sustains himself or herself as an honorable job and as a dignified person, we honor them. When you are taking care of your own needs and you are self-sufficient, that is what it is all about and that is fine. It has been a long time since I was a janitor. I have to admit I was not a very good janitor, but I worked hard. If you look back, 30 years ago when I was a janitor, the gross domestic product of this country has dramatically increased in those 30 years. Yet the money that janitors make in real dollars is about the same. That is it. Our country has had a major increase in wealth, but the janitors make about the same money. It is because our country has been flooded by illegal immigrants who are willing to take those jobs. The people who run the building say, we could not afford to actually hire all these janitors if we had to pay them more money, the market value, without the illegal aliens there. All that would mean if they were paying more money to our own people to clean those toilets, there would be a toilet-cleaning machine and there would be a fellow there, a man or a woman, who could clean 10 times as many toilets with this technology and they would pay him \$50,000, \$60,000, maybe \$70,000 a year. That is a good thing. That is fine.

But, instead, we have had a flood of illegal immigrants and instead of one American earning a decent standard of living and taking care of his family, we have got seven or so illegals who are living substandard, have brought their families in, they are all totally dependent on government benefits, and it is bringing down the quality of our neighborhoods, et cetera; and we have a teeming mass with no hope instead of an American, a proud American being able to take care of his own family and having a decent standard of living. That is what illegals have done to our society. It is a very sinister impact, but it has happened very slowly.

I had an L.A. Times reporter come to my house this weekend looking around, sifting through everything to find out if I had hired any illegals. I did not hire illegals to do my lawn work.

□ 2145

My wife, who just had triplets, as people know here, we did not hire a service unless that service agreed to guarantee that there would be no illegal immigrants in that service. So I try my best.

I try not to buy products from China, because I believe that China is a slave trade state. They use slave labor. But sometimes I end up buying Chinese things unknowingly, as much as I try not to, and I guess sometimes I buy a hamburger from an illegal immigrant.

But let me put it this way. This fellow came to me and said, "Who takes care of your lawn?" It just happens to be that the lady I rent from, and I rent a very modest house in Huntington Beach, her brother, who is a senior citizen and is retired now, takes care of the lawn. That is what he does on the side as a side job.

He said, "All over your neighborhood, your neighbors are using illegal immigrants to do their lawns. Is that bad?"

I said, well, it really is. I will tell you why it is bad. When I was a kid, I did the lawn work. I actually earned all of my spending money by cutting people's lawns, and a lot of my friends did, too.

I think it has a horrible impact on our society that the young people do not cut their own lawns now and earn their own spending money, but instead we let these slave-like laborers come in from different countries and do our lawn work for us. It would be better for our own children to earn their spending money than to pay someone else a pittance so they can live in destitution in our country and then live off of government benefits.

No, that is not the way to a better country. And we have had this impact, and it has been coming on and coming on, and we have not even noticed it, that our kids do not have the dignity now of earning their own spending money by cutting people's lawns.

So that is why we can be such a prosperous country right now, and there can be so much growth in the wealth that is available in our society, yet there is a whole group of people in our country who are being left out. The illegal immigrants are being left out, but so are those people whose wages are being impacted by the illegals' presence here, and it brings down those wages of our average working people. Their share is being gobbled up.

At one end of the spectrum you have got wealthy people. You have got wealthy people over here, they are gobbling that wealth that should go to the middle-class because they are hiring all the illegals and they do not have to pay as much. At the other end of the spectrum it is being gobbled up by bureaucracy and big government.

You have liberals and leftists basically advocating more and more government programs, and what they do, with more and more government programs, they have to tax you more. So what we are doing is taxing the life-

blood and the way of life out of our people in the middle-class, and we are, as well, keeping their wages down and destroying their way of life. They are being attacked by both sides of the political spectrum.

I would say that if it was not for the influx of illegal immigrants today, many of our college students would be out probably doing these jobs during the summer that they say we cannot get Americans to do. I think Americans will take these jobs, if they are given the right kind of pay incentives.

What we have now is a focus tonight on something that I wanted to bring up specifically about the bill that was debated today. My piece of legislation, H.R. 3722, was brought to the floor for a vote.

This piece of legislation is designed to come to grips with a new issue confronting us on illegal immigration, because something happened a few months ago that very few people saw. What I am talking about is the fact that in the Medicare bill, a bill that passed this House, I guess it was 4 or 5 months ago now, when it passed through the House there was not this provision. But when it came back from the Senate, a provision sort of secretly had been inserted by Senator KYL from Arizona. It was the creation of a \$1 billion fund, a \$1 billion fund that will be used to pay for the health care of illegal immigrants, a \$1 billion for the emergency health care of illegal immigrants. It is the first time we actually have a budget item to legally pay for the services of an illegal immigrant.

What does that do? That means that \$1 billion in this fund will go to emergency rooms who take care of illegal immigrants.

Well, what does that mean? That means that in the future, when this is being used, American citizens who do not have health care benefits, and a lot of them do not have health care benefits because the employers will hire illegals if someone demands a health care benefit, an insurance policy, health care insurance, so if they do not have health insurance and then they have to go to the doctor, to the emergency room, what happens? Unless we do something about it, we have set up a perverse priority.

What is going to happen is that the American citizens who do not have health insurance and the legal residents who do not have health insurance are going to be told to go to the back of the line, because we can get the money from the Federal Government to pay for the health care, the emergency health care, of illegals. We quite literally are taking care of foreigners who have come here illegally at the expense of the American people.

My legislation, H.R. 3722, will ensure that the money that we have, the health care that we have, will not be dissipated dramatically by illegals, because what it does is it states very clearly for the hospitals of America, if an illegal immigrant comes to your

emergency room, you do not have to give them extensive treatment for diseases that are not at that moment life-threatening.

Thus, they will take care of an illegal whose life is being threatened, but they will not have to take care and spend \$300,000 or \$400,000 for cancer treatments, and this happens, for all types of transplants of organs, for hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars worth of health care that illegals are getting right now.

My bill says they do not have to do that. If they want to, they can, but they do not have to do it. This legislation is vital to make sure that the pool of money available to the American people for their health care goes to the American people and not to illegals.

It also says that if someone is illegal and they come in and they are an emergency and they are taken care at the hospital, when they are seeking compensation from the fund, they just have to make that same information that they are collecting in order to be compensated, they have to make that available in a computer for the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of Homeland Security.

What we have heard again are bogus arguments this morning, over and over again, that this is going to increase the paperwork of doctors; it is going to make doctors policemen.

Not true. The bill we are talking about not only says the information, that they will collect anyway in order to get compensated by this fund, must be made available to the INS and the Department of Homeland Security. They are not being turned in by anybody, it is just available. The other government agencies at that point have to take over. There is no reporting on the part of the doctors.

So we hear these bogus arguments over and over again, as if people are going to bring some type of contagious diseases into our country if we do not treat every illegal alien that comes into our emergency health care.

Let me note this: If you want to see diseases that will spread in our country being brought into our country from overseas, just make sure that everybody around the world knows that we are now paying for illegal aliens' health care in this country. No matter who gets into the hospital, they will be taken care of. They will bring communicable diseases from all over the world, and that is what is happening right now.

We need to instead come to grips with what my legislation does, that if someone is indeed here illegally and they are dissipating the use and the amount of money that is available for our own citizens or their health care, that illegal alien should be sent home. They should go home to their home country. That is what H.R. 3722 says. The information will be available to the Department of Homeland Security and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and they will proceed from there.

This is not on the back of the doctors. The doctors are freed from responsibility on that, because they no longer have to treat anything, unless someone's life is threatened at that moment.

Let me add one other thing. If they do treat an illegal immigrant in an emergency situation, my bill insists that we go to the employer, because that is the only question that hospital has to ask, who is your employer? And if that employer has not done due diligence to see if he is hiring an illegal immigrant, that employer has to pay for the emergency health care costs of the illegal immigrant. Do you get that? The taxpayers are off the hook.

What has happened is, this bill, which would be an of incredible importance to the middle-class Americans, this bill, which strives to protect us from having our limited health care dollars being drained away by people who have come here illegally, this bill is being attacked by the Chamber of Commerce. It is being attacked by big business on one end, and being attacked by the liberal left organizations that control the Democratic Party on the other.

I suggest tomorrow the vote on H.R. 3722 is one to watch, and whose side you are on will be determined by how they vote on that issue.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4359, CHILD CREDIT PRESERVATION AND EXPANSION ACT OF 2004

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-496) on the resolution (H. Res. 644) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4359) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the child tax credit, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2728, OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH SMALL BUSINESS DAY IN COURT ACT OF 2004, H.R. 2729, OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION EFFICIENCY ACT OF 2004, H.R. 2730, OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH INDEPENDENT REVIEW OF OSHA CITATIONS ACT OF 2004, H.R. 2731, OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH SMALL EMPLOYER ACCESS TO JUSTICE ACT OF 2004, AND H.R. 2432, PAPERWORK AND REGULATORY IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2004

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 108-497) on the resolution (H. Res. 645), providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2728) to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for adjudicative flexibility

with regard to an employer filing of a notice of contest following the issuance of a citation by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2729) to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for greater efficiency at the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission; for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2730) to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for an independent review of citations issued by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2731) to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for the award of attorney's fees and costs to very small employers when they prevail in litigation prompted by the issuance of citations by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2432) to amend the Paperwork Reduction Act and titles 5 and 31, United States Code, to reform Federal paperwork and regulatory processes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

IRAQ WATCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I will shortly be joined by my colleagues, who, on a weekly basis, have come to the floor of the House to discuss events occurring in the Middle East, specifically in Iraq and in Afghanistan. We have called ourselves the Iraq Watch, in an effort to have a conversation to illuminate and educate not just ourselves, but those who are interested, as I think most people are, in these particular matters.

It is clearly no secret, and it is a most disturbing situation, that we have a deteriorating situation in Iraq. One only has to remember the initial estimates of the cost that were put forth by the White House. I think the range that was suggested by the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Mr. Wolfowitz, was from \$30 billion to \$60 billion.

□ 2200

When the then-Chief Economic Adviser to President Bush, Larry Lindsey, indicated that in his judgment the range could be from \$100 billion to \$200 billion, he was eased out because there was a sense that that was not a realistic number. Now, of course, we are currently at the figure of \$150 billion, and that does not include future estimates, which again according to recent reports just simply is for the military presence of American troops in support for other military personnel there. That is an additional 50 or \$75 billion. And of course that does not include the cost of reconstruction, both for Iraq

and for Afghanistan. But, obviously, most importantly is the loss of life, particularly American personnel, both military and civilian. The number now is well in excess of 700. That of course does not account for the men and women in our military who have been wounded.

Many Members of this body have been to Walter Reed Hospital and to Bethesda Naval Hospital and met with the men and women there who have suffered wounds, egregious wounds, that will clearly impact their future and will alter irrevocably the quality of life that they will enjoy for the rest of their lives.

I know that I have attended in my district the funerals of two young men, Sergeant Caldwell and Corporal Jeff Burgess, who gave their lives in Iraq. Furthermore, there was a universal echo of support and sympathy for the United States in the aftermath of our national tragedy on September 11. I think we all remember the headline in the French newspaper, *Le Monde*, that screamed, very poignantly and eloquently the day after 9-11, that "Today We Are All Americans."

It is clear that there was not just sympathy, but a commitment by countries all over the world to assist our efforts to end once and for all the scourge of global terrorism. Unfortunately, much of that international support has eroded. And now the motives of the United States are being called into question, and not just in the Mideast but all over the world.

There was a recent poll that was done by one of the premier polling groups in this country, the Zogby polling group, and it was conducted among the elite in Latin America, the economic elite which traditionally had been supportive of American policy. There was no attempt to interview or survey those that had traditionally been hostile to American interests or who have disagreed with our policies. What I find remarkable was that of the six countries that were surveyed, and they range from Argentina to Brazil to Venezuela to a Central American country, that the negative opinion of the United States Government, the negative opinion of the United States Government exceeded 87 percent. That is particularly disturbing, because I think we can all agree, Mr. Speaker, that we need the international community and its support if we are going to end terrorism. If we are going to protect our homeland, cooperation is absolutely essential. It is absolutely critical. But now American motives are suspect.

There was a recent poll that was done, it was done by the Pew Foundation and the numbers are startling. Majorities in seven nations believe that our intervention in Iraq was motivated by a desire to control Mideast oil. Clearly, there are few Americans that accept that premise. But when one reads the list of nations that believe that our intervention was based simply

on the desire to control oil, we must acknowledge that we have a problem that has to be addressed. Let me just recite some of those numbers: 51 percent of the people in Russia believe that that was our primary motive; 58 percent of the people in France; 60 percent of the people in Germany; 54 percent of the people in Pakistan. In Turkey the number is 64 percent. In Jordan it was 71 percent. And yet we speak of a certain moral authority. But it has become clear that the world does not see us in that lens. They believe our motives are much more crass. And when these numbers are combined with comments and observations and revelations by senior administration officials, they are reinforced.

For those of you that have not had the opportunity to read "The Price of Loyalty," which is a book regarding the tenure of the former Secretary of Treasury, Paul O'Neill, let me commend that book to you; and I would specifically direct your attention to page 96 of that book. Because Secretary O'Neill, a traditional Republican widely regarded in business circles, someone who served his country in the Reagan administration and in Bush One, reveals an anecdote that I find disturbing. Let me read for a moment. O'Neill had seen "brewing a battle since the National Security Council meeting on January 30."

Let me interrupt the excerpt that I will quote to inform my colleagues and the viewing audience that this was 1 week after the inauguration after George W. Bush. One week. The anecdote itself that he reveals occurs February 27, less than maybe 5 weeks, after the President was inaugurated. O'Neill: "It was Powell and his moderates at the State Department versus hardliners like Rumsfeld, CHENEY, and Wolfowitz who were already planning the next war in Iraq in the shape of a post-Saddam country."

Now, let us remember, this is before our national tragedy on 9-11, and this is not coming from outside. This is not an opinion being offered by a Member of the House. This is being offered by the former Secretary who was present at this particular meeting of the National Security Council on February 27, 2001.

"Documents were being prepared by the Defense Intelligence Agency," Rumsfeld's intelligence arm, "mapping Iraq's oil fields and exploration areas, and listing companies that might be interested in leveraging the precious asset." Obviously he means oil. "One document headed 'Foreign Suitors For Iraqi Oil Field Contracts' lists companies from 30 countries, their specialties, bidding histories and in some cases their particular areas of interests. An attached document maps Iraq with markings for supergiant oil fields, other oil fields earmarked for production-sharing while demarking the largely undeveloped southwest of the country into nine blocks to be designated for future exploration."

I guess this is a question that I would have for the President, for the Vice President, and for the Secretary of Defense: Why on February 27, months before the attack on the homeland, why was a map being presented at a National Security Council meeting divvying up the oil reserves of Iraq?

That, I daresay and will submit, is a question, Mr. Speaker, that should be answered by the Secretary, by the National Security Adviser, by the Vice President, and by the President. That is a question that cannot linger, that cannot go unanswered, particularly when a majority of people in countries that are our traditional allies have concluded that our main interest in Iraq is not to bring democracy, is not to save lives, but is to secure oil for our energy needs.

And, again, let me remind my friends who are here, I have been joined by my colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), and the ranking member on the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), let me remind ourselves that we are losing international support. And I am convinced that many of the questions that the rest of the world has is based on reports such as this and have a potential to undermine not just our credibility and our moral authority, but to undermine our national security if we are going to do something in terms of international terrorism.

□ 2215

Because if the world concludes, and if we do not respond that this is our motivation, they will turn their backs on us. When this is all combined with obviously many other issues that are out there, I dare say we have a serious problem.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

(Mr. CONYERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for allowing this intervention, and I begin by commending my colleagues from Pennsylvania and Hawaii and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

It is my intention to offer into this discussion The New Yorker article entitled *The Gray Zone* by Seymour Hersh, which raises one of these other incidents that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) has referred to, and that is, the Abu Ghraib prison in Iraq and the ongoing furor that has taken place around the world.

I would like to ask my colleagues in the course of our discussion this evening whether they feel a need for an investigation conducted from the outside as the 9/11 Commission has, which

it recently concluded, the Warren Commission in terms of the John F. Kennedy assassination, because this problem is beginning to tarnish our Nation's war against terrorism, and without a full and complete and impartial investigation, we will add another way of undermining our national moral authority.

I just wanted to point out that it is mentioned in this article that will be reprinted that, "Rumsfeld's goal was to get a capability in place to take on a high-value target, a standup group to hit quickly," a former high-level intelligence official told me. "He got all the agencies together, the CIA and the NSA, to get pre-approval in place. Just say the code word and go." The operation had across-the-board approval from Rumsfeld and from Condoleezza Rice, the national security adviser. President Bush was informed of the existence of the program, the former intelligence official said."

Here, "Rumsfeld reacted in his usual direct fashion: he authorized the establishment of a highly secret program that was given blanket advance approval to kill or capture and, if possible, interrogate 'high value' targets in the Bush administration's war on terror."

The people, and I conclude with this, "the people assigned to the program worked by the book, the former intelligence official told me," this is Seymour Hersh. "They created code words, and recruited, after careful screening, highly trained commandos and operatives from America's elite forces, Navy SEALs, the Army's Delta Force, and the CIA's paramilitary experts. They also asked some basic questions: 'Do the people working the problem have to use aliases? Yes. Do we need dead drops for the mail? Yes.' No traceability and no budget. And some special-access programs are never fully briefed to Congress."

In other words, a deliberate development of a plan not only to commit these outrageous atrocities that have shocked the world but a way to avoid congressional scrutiny.

I will insert this article that I referred to earlier at this point in the RECORD.

[From The New Yorker, May 17, 2004]

THE GRAY ZONE

(By Seymour M. Hersh)

The roots of the Abu Ghraib prison scandal lie not in the criminal inclinations of a few Army reservists but in a decision, approved last year by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, to expand a highly secret operation, which had been focussed on the hunt for Al Qaeda, to the interrogation of prisoners in Iraq. Rumsfeld's decision embittered the American intelligence community, damaged the effectiveness of elite combat units, and hurt America's prospects in the war on terror.

According to interviews with several past and present American intelligence officials, the Pentagon's operation, known inside the intelligence community by several code words, including Copper Green, encouraged physical coercion and sexual humiliation of

Iraqi prisoners in an effort to generate more intelligence about the growing insurgency in Iraq. A senior C.I.A. official, in confirming the details of this account last week, said that the operation stemmed from Rumsfeld's long-standing desire to wrest control of America's clandestine and paramilitary operations from the C.I.A.

Rumsfeld, during appearances last week before Congress to testify about Abu Ghraib, was precluded by law from explicitly mentioning highly secret matters in an unclassified session. But he conveyed the message that he was telling the public all that he knew about the story. He said, "Any suggestion that there is not a full, deep awareness of what has happened, and the damage it has done, I think, would be a misunderstanding." The senior C.I.A. official, asked about Rumsfeld's testimony and that of Stephen Cambone, his Under-Secretary for Intelligence, said, "Some people think you can bullshit anyone."

The Abu Ghraib story began, in a sense, just weeks after the September 11, 2001, attacks, with the American bombing of Afghanistan. Almost from the start, the Administration's search for Al Qaeda members in the war zone, and its worldwide search for terrorists, came up against major command-and-control problems. For example, combat forces that had Al Qaeda targets in sight had to obtain legal clearance before firing on them. On October 7th, the night the bombing began, an unmanned Predator aircraft tracked an automobile convoy that, American intelligence believed, contained Mullah Mohammad Omar, the Taliban leader. A lawyer on duty at the United States Central Command headquarters, in Tampa, Florida, refused to authorize a strike. By the time an attack was approved, the target was out of reach. Rumsfeld was apoplectic over what he saw as a self-defeating hesitation to attack that was due to political correctness. One officer described him to me that fall as "kicking a lot of glass and breaking doors." In November, the Washington Post reported that, as many as ten times since early October, Air Force pilots believed they'd had senior Al Qaeda and Taliban members in their sights but had been unable to act in time because of legalistic hurdles. There were similar problems throughout the world, as American Special Forces units seeking to move quickly against suspected terrorist cells were compelled to get prior approval from local American ambassadors and brief their superiors in the chain of command.

Rumsfeld reacted in his usual direct fashion: he authorized the establishment of a highly secret program that was given blanket advance approval to kill or capture and, if possible, interrogate "high value" targets in the Bush Administration's war on terror. A special-access program, or SAP—subject to the Defense Department's most stringent level of security—was set up, with an office in a secure area of the Pentagon. The program would recruit operatives and acquire the necessary equipment, including aircraft, and would keep its activities under wraps. America's most successful intelligence operations during the Cold War had been SAPs, including the Navy's submarine penetration of underwater cables used by the Soviet high command and construction of the Air Force's stealth bomber. All the so-called "black" programs had one element in common: the Secretary of Defense, or his deputy, had to conclude that the normal military classification restraints did not provide enough security.

"Rumsfeld's goal was to get a capability in place to take on a high-value target—a standup group to hit quickly," a former high-level intelligence official told me. "He got all the agencies together—the C.I.A. and

the N.S.A.—to get pre-approval in place. Just say the code word and go." The operation had across-the-board approval from Rumsfeld and from Condoleezza Rice, the national-security adviser. President Bush was informed of the existence of the program, the former intelligence official said.

The people assigned to the program worked by the book, the former intelligence official told me. They created code words, and recruited, after careful screening, highly trained commandos and operatives from America's elite forces—Navy SEALs, the Army's Delta Force, and the C.I.A.'s paramilitary experts. They also asked some basic questions: "Do the people working the problem have to use aliases? Yes. Do we need dead drops for the mail? Yes. No traceability and no budget. And some special-access programs are never fully briefed to Congress."

In theory, the operation enabled the Bush Administration to respond immediately to time-sensitive intelligence: commandos crossed borders without visas and could interrogate terrorism suspects deemed too important for transfer to the military's facilities at Guantánamo, Cuba. They carried out instant interrogations—using force if necessary—at secret C.I.A. detention centers scattered around the world. The intelligence would be relayed to the SAP command center in the Pentagon in real time, and sifted for those pieces of information critical to the "white," or overt, world.

Fewer than two hundred operatives and officials, including Rumsfeld and General Richard Myers, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, were "completely read into the program," the former intelligence official said. The goal was to keep the operation protected. "We're not going to read more people than necessary into our heart of darkness," he said. "The rules are 'Grab whom you must. Do what you want.'"

One Pentagon official who was deeply involved in the program was Stephen Cambone, who was named Under-Secretary of Defense for Intelligence in March, 2003. The office was new; it was created as part of Rumsfeld's reorganization of the Pentagon. Cambone was unpopular among military and civilian intelligence bureaucrats in the Pentagon, essentially because he had little experience in running intelligence programs, though in 1998 he had served as staff director for a committee, headed by Rumsfeld, that warned of an emerging ballistic-missile threat to the United States. He was known instead for his closeness to Rumsfeld. "Remember Henry II—Who will rid me of this meddlesome priest?" the senior C.I.A. official said to me, with a laugh, last week. "Whatever Rumsfeld whimsically says, Cambone will do ten times that much."

Cambone was a strong advocate for war against Iraq. He shared Rumsfeld's disdain for the analysis and assessments proffered by the C.I.A., viewing them as too cautious, and chafed, as did Rumsfeld, at the C.I.A.'s inability, before the Iraq war, to state conclusively that Saddam Hussein harbored weapons of mass destruction. Cambone's military assistant, Army Lieutenant General William G. (Jerry) Boykin, was also controversial. Last fall, he generated unwanted headlines after it was reported that, in a speech at an Oregon church, he equated the Muslim world with Satan.

Early in his tenure, Cambone provoked a bureaucratic battle within the Pentagon by insisting that he be given control of all special-access programs that were relevant to the war on terror. Those programs, which had been viewed by many in the Pentagon as sacrosanct, were monitored by Kenneth deGraffenreid, who had experience in counter-intelligence programs. Cambone got control, and deGraffenreid subsequently left

the Pentagon. Asked for comment on this story, a Pentagon spokesman said, "I will not discuss any covert programs; however, Dr. Cambone did not assume his position as the Under-Secretary of Defense for Intelligence until March 7, 2003, and had no involvement in the decision-making process regarding interrogation procedures in Iraq or anywhere else."

In mid-2003, the special-access program was regarded in the Pentagon as one of the success stories of the war on terror. "It was an active program," the former intelligence official told me. "It's been the most important capability we have for dealing with an imminent threat. If we discover where Osama bin Laden is, we can get him. And we can remove an existing threat with a real capability to hit the United States—and do so without visibility." Some of its methods were troubling and could not bear close scrutiny, however.

By then, the war in Iraq had begun. The SAP was involved in some assignments in Iraq, the former official said. C.I.A. and other American Special Forces operatives secretly teamed up to hunt for Saddam Hussein and—without success—for Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. But they weren't able to stop the evolving insurgency.

In the first months after the fall of Baghdad, Rumsfeld and his aides still had a limited view of the insurgency, seeing it as little more than the work of Baathist "dead-enders," criminal gangs, and foreign terrorists who were Al Qaeda followers. The Administration measured its success in the war by how many of those on its list of the fifty-five most wanted members of the old regime—reproduced on playing cards—had been captured. Then, in August, 2003, terror bombings in Baghdad hit the Jordanian Embassy, killing nineteen people, and the United Nations headquarters, killing twenty-three people, including Sergio Vieira de Mello, the head of the U.N. mission. On August 25th, less than a week after the U.N. bombing, Rumsfeld acknowledged, in a talk before the Veterans of Foreign Wars, that "the dead-enders are still with us." He went on, "There are some today who are surprised that there are still pockets of resistance in Iraq, and they suggest that this represents some sort of failure on the part of the Coalition. But this is not the case." Rumsfeld compared the insurgents with those true believers who "fought on during and after the defeat of the Nazi regime in Germany." A few weeks later—and five months after the fall of Baghdad—the Defense Secretary declared, "It is, in my view, better to be dealing with terrorists in Iraq than in the United States."

Inside the Pentagon, there was a growing realization that the war was going badly. The increasingly beleaguered and baffled Army leadership was telling reporters that the insurgents consisted of five thousand Baathists loyal to Saddam Hussein. "When you understand that they're organized in a cellular structure," General Jon Abizaid, the head of the Central Command declared, "that . . . they have access to a lot of money and a lot of ammunition, you'll understand how dangerous they are."

The American military and intelligence communities were having little success in penetrating the insurgency. One internal report prepared for the U.S. military, made available to me, concluded that the insurgents' "strategic and operational intelligence has proven to be quite good." According to the study:

Their ability to attack convoys, other vulnerable targets and particular individuals has been the result of painstaking surveillance and reconnaissance. Inside information has been passed on to insurgent cells about convoy/troop movements and daily habits of

Iraqis working with coalition from within the Iraqi security services, primarily the Iraqi Police force which is rife with sympathy for the insurgents, Iraqi ministries and from within pro-insurgent individuals working with the CPA's so-called Green Zone.

The study concluded, "Politically, the U.S. has failed to date. Insurgencies can be fixed or ameliorated by dealing with what caused them in the first place. The disaster that is the reconstruction of Iraq has been the key cause of the insurgency. There is no legitimate government, and it behooves the Coalition Provisional Authority to absorb the sad but unvarnished fact that most Iraqis do not see the Governing Council—the Iraqi body appointed by the C.P.A.—"as the legitimate authority. Indeed, they know that the true power is the CPA."

By the fall, a military analyst told me, the extent of the Pentagon's political and military misjudgments was clear. Donald Rumsfeld's "dead-enders" now included not only Baathists but many marginal figures as well—thugs and criminals who were among the tens of thousands of prisoners freed the previous fall by Saddam as part of a prewar general amnesty. Their desperation was not driving the insurgency; it simply made them easy recruits for those who were. The analyst said, "We'd killed and captured guys who had been given two or three hundred dollars to 'pray and spray'"—that is, shoot randomly and hope for the best. "They weren't really insurgents but down-and-outers who were paid by wealthy individuals sympathetic to the insurgency." In many cases, the paymasters were Sunnis who had been members of the Baath Party. The analyst said, that the insurgents "spent three of four months figuring out how we operated and developing their own countermeasures. If that meant putting up a hapless guy to go and attack a convoy and see how the American troops responded, they'd do it." Then, the analyst said, "the clever ones began to get in on the action."

By contrast, according to the military report, the American and Coalition forces knew little about the insurgency: "Human intelligence is poor or lacking . . . due to the dearth of competence and expertise. . . . The intelligence effort is not coordinated since either too many groups are involved in gathering intelligence or the final product does not get to the troops in the field in a timely manner." The success of the war was at risk; something had to be done to change the dynamic.

The solution, endorsed by Rumsfeld and carried out by Stephen Cambone, was to get tough with those Iraqis in the Army prison system who were suspected of being insurgents. A key player was Major General Geoffrey Miller, the commander of the detention and interrogation center at Guantánamo, who had been summoned to Baghdad in late August to review prison interrogation procedures. The internal Army report on the abuse charges, written by Major General Antonio Taguba in February, revealed that Miller urged that the commanders in Baghdad change policy and place military intelligence in charge of the prison. The report quoted Miller as recommending that "detention operations must act as an enabler for interrogation."

Miller's concept, as it emerged in recent Senate hearings, was to "Gitmoize" the prison system in Iraq—to make it more focussed on interrogation. He also briefed military commanders in Iraq on the interrogation methods used in Cuba—methods that could, with special approval, include sleep deprivation, exposure to extremes of cold, and heat, and placing prisoners in "stress positions" for agonizing lengths of time. (The Bush Ad-

ministration had unilaterally declared Al Qaeda and other captured members of international terrorist networks to be illegal combatants, and not eligible for the protection of the Geneva Conventions.)

Rumsfeld and Cambone went a step further, however: they expanded the scope of the SAP, bringing its unconventional methods to Abu Ghraib. The commandos were to operate in Iraq as they had in Afghanistan. The male prisoners could be treated roughly, and exposed to sexual humiliation.

"They weren't getting anything substantive from the detainees in Iraq," the former intelligence official told me. "No names. Nothing that they could hang their hat on. Cambone says, I've got to crack this thing and I'm tired of working through the normal chain of command. I've got this apparatus set up—the black special-access program—and I'm going in hot. So he pulls the switch, and the electricity begins flowing last summer. And it's working. We're getting a picture of the insurgency in Iraq and the intelligence is flowing into the white world. We're getting good stuff. But we've got more targets"—prisoners in Iraqi jails—"than people who can handle them."

Cambone then made another crucial decision, the former intelligence official told me: not only would he bring the SAP's rules into the prisons; he would bring some of the Army military-intelligence officers working inside the Iraqi prisons under the SAP's auspices. "So here are fundamentally good soldiers—military-intelligence guys—being told that no rules apply," the former official, who has extensive knowledge of the special-access programs, added. "And, as far as they're concerned, this is a covert operation, and it's to be kept within Defense Department channels."

The military-police prison guards, the former official said, included "recycled hillbillies from Cumberland, Maryland." He was referring to members of the 372nd Military Police Company. Seven members of the company are now facing charges for their role in the abuse at Abu Ghraib. "How are these guys from Cumberland going to know anything? The Army Reserve doesn't know what it's doing."

Who was in charge of Abu Ghraib—whether military police or military intelligence—was no longer the only question that mattered. Hard-core special operatives, some of them with aliases, were working in the prison. The military police assigned to guard the prisoners wore uniforms, but many others—military intelligence officers, contract interpreters, C.I.A. officers, and the men from the special-access program—wore civilian clothes. It was not clear who was who, even to Brigadier General Janis Karpinski, then the commander of the 800th Military Police Brigade, and the officer ostensibly in charge. "I thought most of the civilians there were interpreters, but there were some civilians that I didn't know," Karpinski told me. "I called them the disappearing ghosts. I'd seen them once in a while at Abu Ghraib and then I'd see them months later. They were nice—they'd always call out to me and say, 'Hey, remember me? How are you doing?'" The mysterious civilians, she said, were "always bringing in somebody for interrogation or waiting to collect somebody going out." Karpinski added that she had no idea who was operating in her prison system. (General Taguba found that Karpinski's leadership failures contributed to the abuses.)

By fall, according to the former intelligence official, the senior leadership of the C.I.A. had had enough. "They said, 'No way. We signed up for the core program in Afghanistan—pre-approved for operations against high-value terrorist targets—and now you want to use it for cabdrivers, brothers-in-law, and people pulled off the

streets”—the sort of prisoners who populate the Iraqi jails. “The C.I.A.’s legal people objected,” and the agency ended its SAP involvement in Abu Ghraib, the former official said.

The C.I.A.’s complaints were echoed throughout the intelligence community. There was fear that the situation at Abu Ghraib would lead to the exposure of the secret SAP, and thereby bring an end to what had been, before Iraq, a valuable cover operation. “This was stupidity,” a government consultant told me. “You’re taking a program that was operating in the chaos of Afghanistan against Al Qaeda, a stateless terror group, and bringing it into a structured, traditional war zone. Sooner or later, the commandos would bump into the legal and moral procedures of a conventional war with an Army of a hundred and thirty-five thousand soldiers.”

The former senior intelligence official blamed hubris for the Abu Ghraib disaster. “There’s nothing more exhilarating for a pissant Pentagon civilian than dealing with an important national security issue without dealing with military planners, who are always worried about risk,” he told me. “What could be more boring than needing the cooperation of logistical planners?” The only difficulty, the former official added, is that, “as soon as you enlarge the secret program beyond the oversight capability of experienced people, you lose control. We’ve never had a case where a special-access program went sour—and this goes back to the Cold War.”

In a separate interview, a Pentagon consultant, who spent much of his career directly involved with special-access programs, spread the blame. “The White House subcontracted this to the Pentagon, and the Pentagon subcontracted it to Cambone,” he said. “This is Cambone’s deal, but Rumsfeld and Myers approved the program.” When it came to the interrogation operation at Abu Ghraib, he said, Rumsfeld left the details to Cambone. Rumsfeld may not be personally culpable, the consultant added, “but he’s responsible for the checks and balances. The issue is that, since 9/11, we’ve changed the rules on how we deal with terrorism, and created conditions where the ends justify the means.”

Last week, statements made by one of the seven accused M.P.s, Specialist Jeremy Sivits, who is expected to plead guilty, were released. In them, he claimed that senior commanders in his unit would have stopped the abuse had they witnessed it. One of the questions that will be explored at any trial, however, is why a group of Army Reserve military policemen, most of them from small towns, tormented their prisoners as they did, in a manner that was especially humiliating for Iraqi men.

The notion that Arabs are particularly vulnerable to sexual humiliation became a talking point among pro-war Washington conservatives in the months before the March, 2003, invasion of Iraq. One book that was frequently cited was “The Arab Mind,” a study of Arab culture and psychology, first published in 1973, by Raphael Patai, a cultural anthropologist who taught at, among other universities, Columbia and Princeton, and who died in 1996. The book includes a twenty-five-page chapter on Arabs and sex, depicting sex as a taboo vested with shame and repression. “The segregation of the sexes, the veiling of the women . . . and all the other minute rules that govern and restrict contact between men and women, have the effect of making sex a prime mental preoccupation in the Arab world,” Patai wrote. Homosexual activity, “or any indication of homosexual leanings, as with all other expressions of sexuality, is never given any

publicity. These are private affairs and remain in private.” The Patai book, an academic told me, was “the bible of the neocons on Arab behavior.” In their discussions, he said, two themes emerged—“one, that Arabs only understand force and, two, that the biggest weakness of Arabs is shame and humiliation.”

The government consultant said that there may have been a serious goal, in the beginning, behind the sexual humiliation and the posed photographs. It was thought that some prisoners would do anything—including spying on their associates—to avoid dissemination of the shameful photos to family and friends. The government consultant said, “I was told that the purpose of the photographs was to create an army of informants, people you could insert back in the population.” The idea was that they would be motivated by fear of exposure, and gather information about pending insurgency action, the consultant said. If so, it wasn’t effective; the insurgency continued to grow.

“This shit has been brewing for months,” the Pentagon consultant who has dealt with SAPs told me. “You don’t keep prisoners naked in their cell and then let them get bitten by dogs. This is sick.” The consultant explained that he and his colleagues, all of whom had served for years on active duty in the military, had been appalled by the misuse of Army guard dogs inside Abu Ghraib. “We don’t raise kids to do things like that. When you go after Mullah Omar, that’s one thing. But when you give the authority to kids who don’t know the rules, that’s another.”

In 2003, Rumsfeld’s apparent disregard for the requirements of the Geneva Conventions while carrying out the war on terror had led a group of senior military legal officers from the Judge Advocate General’s (JAG) Corps to pay two surprise visits within five months to Scott Horton, who was then chairman of the New York City Bar Association’s Committee on International Human Rights. “They wanted us to challenge the Bush Administration about its standards for detentions and interrogation,” Horton told me. “They were urging us to get involved and speak in a very loud voice. It came pretty much out the blue. The message was that conditions are ripe for abuse, and it’s going to occur.” The military officials were most alarmed about the growing use of civilian contractors in the interrogation process, Horton recalled. “They said there was an atmosphere of legal ambiguity being created as a result of a policy decision at the highest levels in the Pentagon. The JAG officers were being cut out of the policy formulation process.” They told him that, with the war on terror, a fifty-year history of exemplary application of the Geneva Conventions had come to an end.

The abuses at Abu Ghraib were exposed on January 13th, when Joseph Darby, a young military policeman assigned to Abu Ghraib, reported the wrongdoing to the Army’s Criminal Investigations Division. He also turned over a CD full of photographs. Within three days, a report made its way to Donald Rumsfeld, who informed President Bush.

The inquiry presented a dilemma for the Pentagon. The C.I.D. had to be allowed to continue, the former intelligence official said. “You can’t cover it up. You have to prosecute these guys for being off the reservation. But how do you prosecute them when they were covered by the special-access program? So you hope that maybe it’ll go away.” The Pentagon’s attitude last January, he said, was “Somebody got caught with some photos. What’s the big deal? Take care of it.” Rumsfeld’s explanation to the White House, the official added, was reassuring. “We’ve got a glitch in the program. We’ll prosecute it. The cover story was that some kids got out of control.”

In their testimony before Congress last week, Rumsfeld and Cambone struggled to convince the legislators that Miller’s visit to Baghdad in late August had nothing to do with the subsequent abuse. Cambone sought to assure the Senate Armed Services Committee that the interplay between Miller and Lieutenant General Ricardo Sanchez, the top U.S. commander in Iraq, had only a casual connection to his office. Miller’s recommendations, Cambone said, were made to Sanchez. His own role, he said, was mainly to insure that the “flow of intelligence back to the commands” was “efficient and effective.” He added that Miller’s goal was “to provide a safe, secure and humane environment that supports the expeditious collection of intelligence.”

It was a hard sell. Senator Hillary Clinton, Democrat of New York, posed the essential question facing the senators:

If, indeed General Miller was sent from Guantánamo to Iraq for the purpose of acquiring more actionable intelligence from detainees, then it is fair to conclude that the actions that are at point here in your report [on abuses at Abu Ghraib] are in some way connected to General Miller’s arrival and his specific orders, however they were interpreted, by those MPs and the military intelligence that were involved. . . . Therefore, I for one don’t believe I yet have adequate information from Mr. Cambone and the Defense Department as to exactly what General Miller’s orders were . . . how he carried out those orders, and the connection between his arrival in the fall of ’03 and the intensity of the abuses that occurred afterward.

Sometime before the Abu Ghraib abuses became public, the former intelligence official told me, Miller was “read in”—that is, briefed—on the special-access operation. In April, Miller returned to Baghdad to assume control of the Iraqi prisons; once the scandal hit, with its glaring headlines, General Sanchez presented him to the American and international media as the general who would clean up the Iraqi prison system and instill respect for the Geneva Conventions. “His job is to save what he can,” the former official said. “He’s there to protect the program while limiting any loss of core capability.” As for Antonio Taguba, the former intelligence official added, “He goes into it not knowing shit. And then: ‘Holy cow! What’s going on?’

If General Miller had been summoned by Congress to testify, he, like Rumsfeld and Cambone, would not have been able to mention the special-access program. “If you give away the fact that a special-access program exists,” the former intelligence official told me, “you blow the whole quick-reaction program.”

One puzzling aspect of Rumsfeld’s account of his initial reaction to news of the Abu Ghraib investigation was his lack of alarm and lack of curiosity. One factor may have been recent history: there had been many previous complaints of prisoner abuse from organizations like Human Rights Watch and the International Red Cross, and the Pentagon had weathered them with ease. Rumsfeld told the Senate Armed Services Committee that he had not been provided with details of alleged abuses until late March, when he read the specific charges. “You read it, as I say, it’s one thing. You see these photographs and it’s just unbelievable. . . . It wasn’t three-dimensional. It wasn’t video. It wasn’t color. It was quite a different thing.” The former intelligence official said that in his view, Rumsfeld and other senior Pentagon officials had not studied the photographs because “they thought what was in there was permitted under the rules of engagement,” as applied to the SAP. “The photos,” he added, “turned out to be the result of the program run amok.”

The former intelligence official made it clear that he was not alleging that Rumsfeld or General Myers knew that atrocities were committed. But, he said, "it was their permission granted to do the SAP, generically, and there was enough ambiguity, which permitted the abuses."

This official went on, "The black guys"—those in the Pentagon's secret program—"say we've got to accept the prosecution. They're vaccinated from the reality." The SAP is still active, and "the United States is picking up guys for interrogation. The question is, how do they protect the quick-reaction force without blowing its cover?" The program was protected by the fact that no one on the outside was allowed to know of its existence. "If you even give a hint that you're aware of a black program that you're not read into, you lose your clearances," the former official said. "Nobody will talk. So the only people left to prosecute are those who are undefended—the poor kids at the end of the food chain."

The most vulnerable senior official is Cambone. "The Pentagon is trying now to protect Cambone, and doesn't know how to do it," the former intelligence official said.

Last week, the government consultant, who has close ties to many conservatives, defended the Administration's continued secrecy about the special-access program in Abu Ghraib; "Why keep it black?" the consultant asked. "Because the process is unpleasant. It's like making sausage—you like the result but you don't want to know how it was made. Also, you don't want the Iraqi public, and the Arab world, to know. Remember, we went to Iraq to democratize the Middle East. The last thing you want to do is let the Arab world know how you treat Arab males in prison."

The former intelligence official told me he feared that one of the disastrous effects of the prison-abuse scandal would be the undermining of legitimate operations in the war on terror, which had already suffered from the draining of resources into Iraq. He portrayed Abu Ghraib as a "a tumor" on the war on terror. He said, "As long as it's benign and contained, the Pentagon can deal with the photo crisis without jeopardizing the secret program. As soon as it begins to grow, with nobody to diagnose it—it becomes a malignant tumor."

The Pentagon consultant made a similar point. Cambone and his superiors, the consultant said, "created the conditions that allowed transgressions to take place. And now we're going to end up with another Church Commission"—the 1975 Senate committee on intelligence, headed by Senator Frank Church, of Idaho, which investigated C.I.A. abuses during the previous two decades. Abu Ghraib had sent the message that the Pentagon leadership was unable to handle its discretionary power. "When the shit hits the fan, as it did on 9/11, how do you push the pedal?" the consultant asked. "You do it selectively and with intelligence."

"Congress is going to get to the bottom of this," the Pentagon consultant said. "You have to demonstrate that there are checks and balances in the system." He added, "When you live in a world of gray zones, you have to have very clear red lines."

Senator John McCain, of Arizona, said, "If this is true, it certainly increases the dimension of this issue and deserves significant scrutiny. I will do all possible to get to the bottom of this, and all other allegations."

"In an odd way," Kenneth Roth, the executive director of Human Rights Watch, said, "the sexual abuses at Abu Ghraib have become a diversion for the prisoner abuse and the violation of the Geneva Conventions that is authorized." Since September 11th, Roth added, the military has systematically used

third-degree techniques around the world on detainees. "Some JAGS hate this and are horrified that the tolerance of mistreatment will come back and haunt us in the next war," Roth told me. "We're giving the world a ready-made excuse to ignore the Geneva Conventions. Rumsfeld has lowered the bar."

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan gave a quote there concerning the briefing of Congress. Could the gentleman read that again and attribute where the source of that comment was? Was that an observation or was that a direct quote from someone? Perhaps he can read that text.

Mr. CONYERS. No. This was from the author of the article, Seymour Hersh, the part that determined that the existence of a program was to avoid traceability, to have no budget that was reportable. So we did not have anything to even oversight, and then also that they could avoid congressional scrutiny and a requirement or obligation for being briefed to Congress.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. So we can make absolutely sure, this is Mr. Hersh reporting what information was coming to him, that that was the intent of this approach; is that correct?

Mr. CONYERS. Yes, but what I am trying to do is give us the basis of why there ought to be an investigation. I wish I could vet all of these statements, assertions, and I have as many questions as the gentleman probably does.

The problem is that we are now confronted with taking a few reservists and throwing them into a court-martial situation, when clearly this problem that has been exposed started with more than a few privates and corporals and sergeants, determining how they were going to commit these abuses; that this was sanctioned. This was planned, and I repeat again, the President was informed of the existence of the program, a former intelligence official talking to Seymour Hersh said.

This is an award-winning writer on the American government scene for many years. I need to know more, but I am certainly not going to walk away from this highly complex information that has been presented to us.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for bringing the Seymour Hersh article to the attention of the House today. I read that this afternoon, and I agree with my colleague, the impact of that article clearly is this was a planned special operation that did not originate with the privates and the sergeants but at the highest levels of the Bush administration.

But the question I wanted to ask my colleague, what I got out of the article

was that not only was this a very clear attempt, if the article is accurate, by the Bush administration to set up an intelligence-gathering mechanism and operation that would be free and clear of any congressional oversight, but that they were taking these procedures and methods from Afghanistan, where we were clearly fighting terrorists and had terrorists in custody, and were interrogating terrorists and where we had announced, rightly or wrongly, that the Geneva Conventions would not apply. Then we were taking these methods and procedures to a more traditional war zone in Iraq and applying them to the detainees in the Iraqi prisons, notably Abu Ghraib, where the detainees were a bunch of people off the street, street criminals, rock throwers, hoodlums, maybe some terrorists, but certainly a wide number of just disaffected Iraqis who got swept up by the police and by the Army in an urban setting that was a traditional war zone. Yet, here the American operation was using these same interrogation approaches that we have been using against known terrorists in a lawless situation in Afghanistan.

This seems to me to be the root of the problem. First off, there is clear accountability to the very top of the Defense Department and the White House, and every time those gentlemen talk about just a few bad apples, it sets my hackles on edge because clearly they are trying to avoid accountability and responsibility.

The fundamental error they made was, in my judgment, taking this from a terror interrogation into interrogation of street criminals and routine suspects that have so badly backfired on our image in Iraq.

So I wonder, does the gentleman read the article the same way as I do?

Mr. CONYERS. I do, because they said they were taking people walking off the streets, taxi drivers, in-laws of somebody who may be more seriously implicated, and that they were bringing in an expert from Guantanamo. They do not make them enemy combatants so that these folks have no rights under the Geneva Conventions whatsoever, and the whole thing reads like an absolute nightmare. They are naming names and they are naming strategies. This so-called, what do we call it, the secret access program.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Very aptly known as SAP, S-A-P.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time for a moment, because I know we are joined by our friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE), and again, I think we are coming back to an issue that has to be discussed here, and that is an issue of competence.

There is nobody in this chamber that is not committed to making every effort, every responsible effort to end the threat of terrorism, not just against the United States but all over the globe. What I think the world has concluded, as most Americans have concluded, is that the information that

was provided to this administration indicating that there was weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and that there were linkages between Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda were absolutely false, absolutely false.

What we have learned is that much of this information was provided by an exiled group called the Iraqi National Congress, headed by this particular gentleman here with the sunglasses on whose name is Ahmed Chalabi, who for years was working to return to Iraq.

Mr. Chalabi is an interesting and controversial figure, of course, because during his exile he lived for a time in Jordan, and while he was there, he was charged with and accused and convicted of the crime of embezzlement in the amount of some \$30 million. He was sentenced to a term of 22 years in prison. Somehow during his exile he became friendly with or developed relationships with Richard Pearl, who formerly served on the Defense Advisory Board, with the Vice President Mr. CHENEY, and with others in the so-called neo-conservative movement.

□ 2230

And they believed what he had to say. And it has been proven to be false.

And I thought what was particularly interesting was that this past weekend our Secretary of State, Colin Powell, made a statement, I think it was on "Meet the Press," that he now believes, and I am reading again from the New York Times dated today, that "he now believes that the Central Intelligence Agency was deliberately misled about evidence that Saddam Hussein was developing unconventional weapons."

Now, stop for a moment to think of this, that the Secretary of State, who made the presentation before the world at the United Nations, who built the case for this White House and for this President, now indicates that he was or the CIA was misled. The report goes on, "He hinted at widespread reports," this is Secretary Powell, "of fabrications by an engineer who provided much of the critical information about the so-called bioweapons labs. Intelligence officials have since found that the engineer was linked to the Iraqi National Congress, an exiled group that was pressing President Bush to unseat Mr. Hussein." This is a quote by the Secretary of State. "It turned out that the sourcing was inaccurate and wrong and, in some cases, deliberately misleading," Mr. Powell said in an interview broadcast from Jordan, "and for that I am disappointed and I regret it."

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, my constituents are tired of being suckered with false information that both precipitated and continue this war in Iraq, and they want some accountability of what happened with such a massive amount of misinformation given to the

American people leading up to this war. They want accountability, and they deserve accountability.

We offered today an amendment to the defense authorizations bill to be considered this week that will give Americans some accountability on the source of this information, of Mr. Chalabi's rogue group, this alleged Iraqi National Congress. And there is nothing congressional about it. It is a bunch of folks that want to go back in and run Iraq and who convinced the neoconservatives who are behind this war that we would all be greeted with rose petals because Mr. Chalabi would be seen as the great savior of Iraq.

This great fantasy was bought hook, line and sinker by the President of the United States and the administration, and it was a fraud. And it is time for the American taxpayers to have accountability here.

Now, what I am told, and I want to make sure it is true, but I am told taxpayers are still paying this group, this group that gave us, apparently willfully, or potentially willfully, false information leading to this war. We are still paying \$350,000 a month for their great services in Iraq. What did this group do for the American people? It got us into a war based on false administration they gave to the administration. The administration was all too happy to accept that there were weapons of mass destruction there; that there was a connection to 9-11 and that they would be greeted as liberators, the three legs of this stool, all of which were false. And we are still paying these people.

So we will offer an amendment, hopefully tomorrow it will be allowed, I hope the majority will allow it to be considered, which will cut that money off, assuming the things I have suggested are true; and I believe they are. So we need some accountability here of this group. We cannot continue it.

And I want to make sure people understand how dire this is and how hoodwinked this administration was. And, frankly, I think they were patsies for this group. We paid millions of dollars very shortly after the Iraqi Army collapsed to fly into Iraq, I am told like some 800 or 900 of the cohorts and the coconspirators, if I can use the pejorative term that I think is appropriate here, of Mr. Chalabi's. We flew them into Baghdad, and it was going to be the sort of great saviors flying in that would be the recipient of all these rose petals and would quickly reestablish them as the functioning government of Iraq.

Surprise. They were not really welcomed with open arms in Baghdad. Totally failed. Wasted our millions of dollars, and they are still taking money from the taxpayers. Now, here is one mistake, at least one mistake the administration ought to own up to and fix so we do not continue pouring money down a rat hole in Iraq with the Iraqi National Congress, which has not helped us one wit.

Because, frankly, what Iraq needs is a real congress which is elected by the Iraqi people. These guys who are under indictment in Jordan, you cannot parachute him in and expect him to be welcomed as the savior of Iraq.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield on that point.

Mr. INSLEE. Let me say one more thing. We need elections sooner rather than later in Iraq to vest them with their own destiny, and I will offer an amendment to do that as well.

I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, on that point, perhaps one of my esteemed colleagues could enlighten me as to the status of Mr. Chalabi and his brethren with respect to the sovereignty issue that is supposed to come to full fruition on June 30. I am unable to determine from my inquiries as to exactly where the United Nations representative, Mr. Chalabi, and Mr. Bremer cross paths.

And to the degree or extent that they are in contact with one another, let alone in league with one another, exactly what the elements of that sovereignty will be with respect to this Iraqi governing council and Mr. Chalabi. Do any of my colleagues have any information on that or is everybody as much in the dark as I believe the American people and the Iraqi people are?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

Mr. HOEFFEL. Well, I was just going to say that we have as much of a clue as the American officials in Iraq have, which is no clue at all. I do not think anybody has any idea what is going to happen on June 30.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Well, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman to take the time back on that point?

Mr. HOEFFEL. Sure.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I, unfortunately, believe that we probably have a pretty good idea what is going to happen at that point. I believe that the American Armed Forces will be set adrift on a desert sea of anxiety, insecurity, and ineptitude.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT) has characterized the present situation with respect to our policy as one of rampant incompetence, but I think that it is unfortunately all too safe to say that that will manifest itself on June 30 with an utter incapacity to discern even momentarily what the military mission of the United States Armed Forces will be at that point, other than to try to survive the day, survive the week, survive the month, survive any stop-loss that the Secretary of Defense might impose on the troops there and then get home.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. DELAHUNT).

Mr. DELAHUNT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think we have the answers. But, again, let me go back to this issue of

competence, because the President of the United States described the Secretary of Defense as a superb leader. I reject that description. I reject that description out of hand. One only has to see example after example, such as the relationship, and not just a single incident, with Mr. Chalabi. Clearly, the Kingdom of Jordan, which has been a steadfast ally of the United States, was insulted by the appointment of this individual, who is a convicted felon, to the Iraqi Governing Council.

King Abdulla of Jordan was here. I and several other members of the Committee on International Relations, I believe I was joined by my colleague here tonight, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL), at a luncheon when I posed the question to the King, and congratulated him, by the way, for moving towards the democratization, if you will, of Jordan, whether he was ever consulted by Secretary Rumsfeld or by the President about the appointment of Mr. Chalabi. And he said, no, he was not even consulted. Yet here is an individual who established a bank, one of the largest banks in Jordan, then embezzled, according to the conviction, millions of dollars, causing the bank to collapse; and he then escaped from Jordan.

When asked just recently about Ahmed Chalabi potentially becoming the prime minister in the interim government, what King Abdulla said was, "He was not the ideal choice." I dare say that was extremely diplomatic.

But at the same time let me go and quote another individual who has earned the respect of Members of this body and the American people, David Kay. Remember David Kay? He was assigned the task by this President, by this Secretary of Defense to go find the weapons of mass destruction; and he came back and said there are no weapons of mass destruction, Mr. President, and testified before the United States Senate that we were all wrong. We were all wrong.

But, of course, this White House, Mr. Bush and Mr. CHENEY and Mr. Rumsfeld cannot acknowledge that they were wrong. They were wrong about the weapons of mass destruction. They were wrong about the links between al Qaeda and Saddam Hussein. And now we find ourselves in a quagmire.

But this is what Mr. Kay had to say, who, by the way, was one of the most hawkish members of the United Nations monitors that went out and that was part of that inspection team, and who actually supported the war. But here is what he had to say. He now believes the Western countries' intelligence agencies got it wrong for two reasons. He is referring to the weapons of mass destruction. First, they were manipulated by Ahmed Chalabi and other dissidents whose central interest was ousting Saddam.

Just mentioning the name of the Iraqi National Congress leader makes Kay laugh. There is a guy who is so transparent. Chalabi asked me once,

and again this is Mr. Kay speaking, why are you so concerned about the weapons of mass destruction? No one cares about weapons of mass destruction. And when asked by Tom Brokaw was he embarrassed, no, his response was, we are heroes in error.

Well that error has cost the American taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars, the lives of American young men and women, and the loss of American moral authority and prestige in the war. Mr. Chalabi, that is disgraceful. That is disgraceful.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. DELAHUNT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Perhaps it would be useful for us to note at this point that Mr. Chalabi does not occupy his position as a result of unilateral action on his part. Mr. Chalabi occupies this position because of the overt policies of this administration. The reason he is there, the reason that we are unable at this stage, at this stage, just prior to June 30, to say exactly what his position will be in the future is because he continues to receive the favor of this administration. He is there because Mr. Bush saw that he went there. He is there because he is supported to this day, to this moment by this administration.

Everything that has been said concerning him this evening is true. It is factual. It is contextual. We understand the meaning of what he said when he said we were heroes in error. And I happened to see that announcement; and let me tell my colleagues the words do not convey the sense of triumph, the sense of disdain, the condescending attitude or sense of his countenance when he pronounced those words. He was pleased with himself that he had been able to mislead the administration and that he was getting away with it.

It is one thing to deliberately mislead someone. They may not know what was going on. They may not know what happened. Maybe they should have known. Maybe they should have been paying more attention in the administration, but to give them the widest benefit of a doubt, perhaps they did not. But once someone announces to your face that you have been misled, and deliberately so, to continue to receive the favor of the person who made the appointment and allows it to continue, tells more about the person who does the appointing and ostensibly holds the power than it does about Mr. Chalabi.

□ 2245

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, it can be summed up in one word, incompetence, and a lack of leadership and an inability to wage a war against terrorism that will succeed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOFFEL).

Mr. HOFFEL. Mr. Speaker, just over a year ago at one of our first Iraq

Watches, I recounted a visit that Mr. Chalabi paid to my office, as I think he did to most members of the Committee on International Relations in October 2002, just before the vote here in the House on the war authority on Iraq.

I talked to Mr. Chalabi for 10 or 15 minutes. He had an aide with him, and my chief of staff was with me. They left, and I turned to my aide and I said, That is the kind of man that my grandfather would have called a four-flusher. I do not think I have used that term since my grandfather died in the 1980s. I am not quite sure what it means. I think it must come from poker where a player has four cards for a flush, does not have the fifth, and you are all hot air and cannot be trusted and you are just a spin doctor.

That is exactly the impression that I got from Ahmed Chalabi that day, that he was spinning. He was spinning me, he was spinning the Congress, he was not a man of substance and not someone we should trust.

The sad fact is, as my colleagues have said here tonight, the administration trusted him. Paul Wolfowitz trusted him, Doug Faith, Donald Rumsfeld trusted him, and because those individuals trusted him, our President trusted him; and he is not worthy of our trust. As a matter of fact, I think we need to talk about all of this talk about resignations in the Department of Defense. I do not think we should allow those civilian authorities in the DOD the luxury of resigning. The President ought to fire them. He ought to fire Rumsfeld and Faith for the bad advice they have given him, for believing in people like Chalabi, for the lack of planning in Iraq, for sending troops over there without enough numbers, without the armored vehicles to keep them safe.

The failures of leadership in the Department of Defense are so great, including believing Chalabi, that the civilian leadership ought to go. While the President is at it, he ought to get rid of George Tenet for the bad intelligence regarding the failure of the weapons of mass destruction intelligence.

The only person that ought to resign in the administration is Colin Powell, because his advice is not being listened to, but that is another matter.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman has put his finger on what we ought to call the Chalabi principle in the Bush administration. The Chalabi principle is this: If you tell the truth, you get fired by the President. If you tell a falsehood, you get promoted and praised.

That is a pretty strong statement, but let us look at the facts. General Shinseki told the truth. He said we are going to need several hundred thousand troops to prevent massive looting and anarchy after the army collapses, and it was true; so they canned him. General Zinni said the same thing; he gracefully was allowed to retire. Joe Wilson told the truth and pointed out that the President told a significant

falsehood to the American people and Congress in the State of the Union address, asserting that Iraq was getting uranium to build a nuclear weapon. He told the truth and so the President's people punished Mr. WILSON's wife by outing her CIA employment, which should be a Federal crime.

So if you tell the truth in the Bush administration, you can be canned, punished, and your wife's career gets destroyed. But if you tell a falsehood, like Mr. Chalabi's outfit who gave us repeated misinformation, according to the Secretary of State, you get praised, you get the President trying to get you an in in the new government in Iraq, and you get \$350,000 a month of taxpayers' money, together with the millions of dollars we spent trying to parachute them into Baghdad to form a new government, which was an abject failure, you are praised.

If you are Paul Wolfowitz, who told the Congress that oil revenues would pay for this and we would be greeted with rose petals, you are praised by the President.

And if you are the Defense Secretary, if you are wrong about WMD, wrong about the connection with 9/11, wrong about the number of troops we need, and wrong about not having armor and how we are going to pay for it and how much it is going to cost, if you are wrong about not having early elections, the Vice President says you are the best Secretary of Defense America has ever had. This is the Chalabi principle. We need to break this.

This is one of the things wrong with our Iraqi policy. The people telling the truth are not listened to, and the people fouling up get promoted. That needs to change.

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, what is interesting is that David Kay, highly respected, the man that was charged by this President, it did not take him too long to conclude that Mr. Chalabi was transparent, a manipulator, a con man, if you will.

In addition to all that the gentleman has said, do my colleagues remember when the President of the United States delivered the State of the Union address this year, in January of 2004, who was sitting up right there in the gallery in the Bush family box? Does the gentleman remember?

Mr. HOEFFEL. I remember. It was Mr. Chalabi.

Mr. DELAHUNT. It boggles the mind, it is such rank incompetence, it is such an inability to see reality, to be fooled. It is not incompetence, it is gross negligence. In some other forum it might almost be funny, but here it is so tragic because it is not just about this President and this Vice President, but it is about war and peace and the American people and how we are viewed in the world, and it is the blood of our children, and it is mortgaging our future.

We should walk away from Mr. Chalabi now and begin to restore the confidence of the world in our ability

to match reality and our dreams and aspirations.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that these discussions that we have held and are holding weekly on the floor here are meant to communicate with our colleagues and with the American people. This is our forum to do it. I think those who may be observing our proceedings here today need to take up, if they believe what we have said tonight, the cause of having Mr. Bush remove his support from Mr. Chalabi.

I think people across the country have to ask their representatives, as well as communicate with the White House. They have to ask their Representatives and Senators, do you support this Chalabi administration and the Iraqi Governing Council? Do you support Mr. Chalabi being a part of this sovereignty movement after June 30? If you do, there have to be serious questions about your competence to be holding office and acting on our behalf.

This is a question that needs to be asked. Americans need not feel impotent, they need not feel they are merely observers of what other people are doing to you and doing to this country. You can demand of your elected Representatives and Senators, where do you stand on this Chalabi issue?

It is not a matter of getting an individual, I am sure we all agree. He is representative of a failure of leadership. His position in the Iraqi Governing Council is an insult to those people who have been wounded and who have been killed during this war. It is an insult to those of us who uphold genuine ideas about freedom and democracy and their spread. So long as this man is there, being the official representative of the United States to the Iraqi Governing Council, to that same degree will we be disenabled from achieving any of these goals, regardless of how one feels about going to war in Iraq or not.

This is what needs to be done. You have to demand of your representatives, where do you stand on this issue of his continued presence as being officially supported by the United States of America?

Mr. DELAHUNT. Let me reclaim my time for a moment. I think it is important for Americans to understand that during the course of this week, we will be debating a bill that is described as the defense reauthorization bill. It is our purpose collectively as members of this informal group that came to being as a result of the gentleman from Pennsylvania's brainstorm almost a year ago now, this informal group is going to make every single effort to eliminate the funding and the authority for the funding for the Iraqi National Congress that is receiving some \$4 million a year, as the gentleman indicates. For what, we do not know. For bad information, for self-aggrandizement, for certainly not the best interests of the United States.

We again, as the gentleman suggests, recommend that anyone who is inter-

ested in this issue, that shares our concern and our belief that this is very much a linchpin to beginning to restore our international respect and support, to contact their Senators and their Representatives to assist in this effort, to read about, not just listen to our comments, but to become engaged, educate themselves as to the role of this individual in the course of the past several years and the consequences to the United States simply because there were people in this administration, so-called neoconservatives that were looking for a reason to go to war in Iraq long before our national tragedy of September 11.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. This is why it is so important, and I want to make sure everyone understands. We can do this. We do have a bill coming up this week, and if we are able to get on the agenda on the floor, we can stop the support for this group. It is fundamental to advancing the genuine interests of the United States and reestablishing some semblance of a foundation on behalf of freedom that we stop Chalabi from being represented on the Governing Council, as having the support of the United States of America.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON of Indiana (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of official business in the district.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of personal business.

Ms. WOOLSEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical reasons.

Mr. BACHUS (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of travel delay.

Mr. ENGLISH (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of travel delay.

Mr. LEACH (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of leading an official United States delegation to Taiwan.

Mr. TAUZIN (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today and the balance of the week on account of medical reasons.

Mr. TIAHRT (at the request of Mr. DELAY) for today on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINOJOSA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEKS of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. AKIN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and May 18, 19, and 20.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HENSARLING, for 5 minutes, May 19.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PEARCE, for 5 minutes, May 19.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 18, 2004, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the third quarter of 2003 and the first quarter of 2004, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Kay Granger	10/3	10/5	Canada		753.00						753.00
Commercial airfare							2,210.71				2,210.71
Hon. C.W. Bill Young	10/22	10/23	Spain		298.00		(³)				298.00
	10/23	10/28	Italy		614.00						614.00
David Jolly	10/22	10/23	Spain		298.00		(³)				298.00
	10/23	10/28	Italy		614.00		(³)				614.00
Hon. Jim Kolbe	11/8	11/10	Jordan (& Iraq)		476.00		(³)				476.00
	11/10	11/11	Syria		262.75		(³)				262.75
	11/11	11/12	Germany		241.00		(³)				241.00
Scott B. Gudes	11/8	11/10	Jordan (& Iraq)		476.00		(³)				476.00
	11/10	11/11	Syria		262.75		(³)				262.75
	11/11	11/12	Germany		241.00		(³)				241.00
John Blazey	11/8	11/10	Jordan (& Iraq)		476.00		(³)				476.00
	11/10	11/11	Syria		262.75		(³)				262.75
	11/11	11/12	Germany		241.00		(³)				241.00
Hon. James P. Morgan	11/8	11/10	Jordan (& Iraq)		476.00		(³)				476.00
	11/10	11/11	Syria		262.75		(³)				262.75
	11/11	11/12	Germany		241.00		(³)				241.00
Hon. John E. Sweeney	11/8	11/10	Jordan (& Iraq)		476.00		(³)				476.00
	11/10	11/11	Syria		262.75		(³)				262.75
	11/11	11/12	Germany		241.00		(³)				241.00
Hon. Jo Ann Emerson	11/8	11/10	Jordan (& Iraq)		476.00		(³)				476.00
	11/10	11/11	Syria		262.75		(³)				262.75
	11/11	11/12	Germany		241.00		(³)				241.00
Hon. Dave Weldon	11/8	11/10	Jordan (& Iraq)		476.00		(³)				476.00
	11/10	11/11	Syria		262.75		(³)				262.75
	11/11	11/12	Germany		241.00		(³)				241.00
Hon. Charles H. Taylor	11/8	11/10	Jordan (& Iraq)		476.00		(³)				476.00
	11/10	11/11	Syria		262.75		(³)				262.75
	11/11	11/12	Germany		241.00		(³)				241.00
Hon. Tom Latham	11/8	11/10	Jordan (& Iraq)		476.00		(³)				476.00
	11/10	11/11	Syria		262.75		(³)				262.75
	11/11	11/12	Germany		241.00		(³)				241.00
Hon. Patrick J. Kennedy	11/8	11/10	Jordan (& Iraq)		476.00		(³)				476.00
	11/10	11/11	Syria		262.75		(³)				262.75
	11/11	11/12	Germany		241.00		(³)				241.00
Hon. David E. Price	11/8	11/10	Jordan (& Iraq)		476.00						476.00
	11/10	11/11	Syria		262.75						262.75
	11/11	11/12	Germany		241.00						241.00
Hon. David Hobson	11/15	11/17	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
Hon. Robert Aderholt	11/15	11/17	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
Hon. Steny Hoyer	11/15	11/17	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
Brian Potts	11/15	11/17	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
Sarah Young	11/13	11/16	Germany		300.00						300.00
	11/16	11/18	Italy		1,000.00						1,000.00
Commercial airfare							4,946.28				4,946.28
Hon. Frank Wolf	12/3	12/7	Jordan (& Iraq)		916.00						916.00
Commercial Transportation							6,945.52				6,945.52
John Shank	11/30	12/2	United Kingdom		842.00						842.00
	12/2	12/4	Bulgaria		530.00						530.00
	12/4	12/7	Italy		1,383.00						1,383.00
Commercial airfare							6,131.37				6,131.37
Beverly Airmar Pheto	11/30	12/2	Hong Kong		822.00						822.00
	12/2	12/4	Thailand		456.00						456.00
	12/4	12/6	Singapore		512.00						512.00
Commercial airfare							7,311.93				7,311.93
Elizabeth A. Phillips	12/3	12/10	Italy		2,100.00						2,100.00
								681.81			681.81
Commercial airfare							5,796.22				5,796.22
Hon. Dave Weldon	11/30	12/2	Zambia		690.00						690.00
	12/2	12/3	Rwanda		201.00						201.00
	12/3	12/4	Kenya		295.00						295.00
Commercial Transportation							8,781.06				8,781.06
John Blazey	12/8	12/18	India		2,488.00						2,488.00
Commercial airfare							9,410.00				9,410.00
Hon. Jack Kingston	12/11	12/13	Kuwait (& Iraq)		804.00						804.00
	12/14	12/14	Germany		191.00						191.00
Committee total					31,080.00		51,533.09		681.81		83,294.90

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

May 17, 2004

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H3081

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 5 AND DEC. 17, 2003

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mark Foley	12/5	12/7	Italy		872.00		3,612.41				4,484.41
Committee total											4,484.41

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL THOMAS, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. CHRIS CONNELLY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 2 AND APR. 9, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Chris Connelly	4/3	4/6	Ireland		1,377.00						1,377.00
	4/6	4/9	Hungary	157,162.00	762.00						762.00
Committee total					2,139.00						2,139.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CHRIS CONNELLY, Apr. 26, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. ANDREW J. KEISER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 2 AND APR. 9, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Andrew J. Keiser	4/3	4/4	Qatar		148.00						148.00
	4/4	4/7	Jordan		714.00						714.00
	4/7	4/9	Hungary		508.00						508.00
Committee total					1,370.00						1,370.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

ANDREW J. KEISER, Apr. 30, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. THOMAS G. DUNCAN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 18 AND APR. 23, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Thomas G. Duncan	4/18	4/23	Mexico		1,690.00		2,300.19				3,990.19
Committee total					1,690.00		2,300.19				3,990.19

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

THOMAS G. DUNCAN, Apr. 29, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, MR. FRED L. TURNER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 21 AND APR. 24, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Fred L. Turner	4/21	4/24	Denmark	DKK 5695.44	912.00					DKK 5695.44	912.00
Committee total					912.00						912.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FRED L. TURNER, Apr. 28, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY MEETING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 13 AND FEB. 19, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Doug Bereuter	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,660.00						
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00						
Hon. John Boozman	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,660.00						
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00						
Hon. Jo Ann Emerson	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,660.00						
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00						
Hon. Paul Gillmor	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,660.00						
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00						
Hon. Joel Hefley	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,660.00						
	2/17	2/18	Germany		211.00						

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO THE NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY MEETING, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 13 AND FEB. 19, 2004—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Peter King	2/18	2/19	France		460.00		(³)				2,331.00
	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,660.00		(³)				
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00		(³)				2,580.00
Hon. Dennis Moore	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,660.00		(³)				
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00		(³)				2,580.00
Hon. John Tanner	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,660.00		(³)				
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00		(³)				2,580.00
Hon. Ellen Tauscher	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,660.00		(³)				
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00		(³)				2,580.00
Robin Evans	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,660.00		(³)				
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00		(³)				2,580.00
Charles Johnson	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,660.00		2,989.37				5,569.37
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00		(³)				
John Lis	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,660.00		2,989.37				5,569.37
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00		(³)				
Vince Morelli	2/14	2/17	Belgium		1,245.00		2,989.37				5,569.37
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00						
Susan Olson	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,930.00		⁶ 5,767.07				7,932.07
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00						
Marilyn Owen	2/13	2/17	Belgium		1,660.00		⁶ 5,767.07				8,617.07
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00		(³)				
Mark Wellman	2/14	2/17	Belgium		1,245.00		2,989.37				5,569.37
	2/17	2/19	France		920.00						7,932.07
Delegation Expenses:											
Representational Functions									5,044.44		5,044.44
Miscellaneous									286.74		286.74
Committee total					40,471.00		29,399.34		5,331.18		75,201.52

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

⁴ By train.

⁵ Military and commercial air transportation.

⁶ Commercial air transportation.

DOUGLAS BEREUTER, Apr. 22, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	2/14	2/17	Denmark		939.00	(³)					939.00
	2/17	2/19	Ireland		962.00	(³)					962.00
	2/19	2/21	Norway		672.00	(³)					672.00
Hon. Frank Lucas	1/13	1/14	Marshall Islands		225.00	(³)					225.00
	1/14	1/15	Micronesia		325.00	(³)					325.00
Hon. Steve King	2/14	2/17	Denmark		939.00	(³)					939.00
	2/17	2/19	Ireland		962.00		1,104.80				2,066.80
Hon. Gil Gutknecht	2/15	2/16	Hungary		508.00		5,807.87				6,315.87
	2/17	2/18	Albania		603.00						603.80
	2/18	2/22	Germany		1,488.00						1,488.00
Shelley Husband	2/14	2/17	Denmark		939.00	(³)					939.00
	2/17	2/19	Ireland		962.00	(³)					962.00
	2/19	2/21	Norway		672.00	(³)					672.00
Lynn Gallagher	2/14	2/17	Denmark		939.00	(³)					939.00
	2/17	2/19	Ireland		962.00	(³)					962.00
	2/19	2/21	Norway		672.00	(³)					672.00
Brent Gattis	2/14	2/17	Denmark		939.00	(³)					939.00
	2/17	2/19	Ireland		962.00	(³)					962.00
	2/19	2/21	Norway		672.00	(³)					672.00
Jason Vaillancourt	2/14	2/17	Denmark		939.00	(³)					939.00
	2/17	2/19	Ireland		962.00	(³)					962.00
	2/19	2/21	Norway		672.00	(³)					672.00
Laverne Hubert	2/14	2/17	Denmark		939.00	(³)					939.00
	2/17	2/19	Ireland		962.00	(³)					962.00
	2/19	2/21	Norway		672.00	(³)					672.00
Committee total					20,488.00		6,912.67				27,400.67

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, Apr. 21, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Valerie L. Baldwin	1/5	1/6	Germany		250.00						250.00
	1/6	1/8	Italy		664.00						664.00
	1/8	1/9	Tunisia		211.00						211.00
	1/9	1/11	Italy		1,440.00						1,440.00
Commercial airfare							5,169.40				5,169.40
Dale Oak	1/5	1/6	Greece		284.00						284.00
	1/6	1/8	Italy		960.00						960.00
	1/8	1/9	Tunisia		211.00						211.00
	1/9	1/12	Italy		1,144.00						1,144.00
Commercial airfare							4,865.46				4,865.46
John Scofield	1/5	1/6	Greece		284.00						284.00
	1/6	1/8	Italy		960.00						960.00
	1/8	1/9	Tunisia		211.00						211.00
	1/9	1/12	Italy		1,144.00						1,144.00
Commercial airfare							4,865.46				4,865.46

May 17, 2004

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H3083

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Mark Murray	1/9	1/12	Uganda		850.00						850.00
	1/12	1/18	Congo		1,000.00						1,000.00
Commercial airfare							8,350.43				8,350.43
Christine R. Kojac	1/13	1/15	Thailand		579.00						579.00
	1/15	1/18	Cambodia		933.00						933.00
	1/18	1/19	Singapore		512.00						512.00
Commercial airfare							5,610.41				5,610.41
John Blazey	1/10	1/13	Vietnam		579.00						579.00
	1/13	1/15	Thailand		464.00						464.00
	1/15	1/18	Cambodia		933.00						933.00
	1/18	1/19	Singapore		256.00						256.00
Commercial airfare							9,544.15				9,544.15
Hon. David L. Hobson	1/12	1/14	Kuwait		1,056.00						1,056.00
	1/14	1/15	Kyrgystan		183.00						183.00
	1/15	1/16	Italy		334.00		(³)				334.00
Hon. John P. Murtha	1/12	1/14	Kuwait		1,056.00						1,056.00
	1/14	1/15	Kyrgystan		183.00						183.00
	1/15	1/16	Italy		334.00		(³)				334.00
Scott Lilly	1/12	1/14	Kuwait		1,056.00						1,056.00
	1/14	1/15	Kyrgystan		183.00						183.00
	1/15	1/16	Italy		334.00		(³)				334.00
David Morrison	1/12	1/14	Kuwait		1,056.00						1,056.00
	1/14	1/15	Kyrgystan		183.00						183.00
	1/15	1/16	Italy		334.00		(³)				334.00
Jeff Ashford	1/22	1/25	Italy		1,307.00						1,307.00
	1/25	1/27	Bulgaria		455.50						455.50
Commercial airfare							5,888.30		105.00		5,888.30
Tom McLemore	1/22	1/25	Italy		1,307.00						1,307.00
	1/25	1/27	Bulgaria		455.50						455.50
Commercial airfare							5,888.30		56.00		5,888.30
Tammy Hughes	1/22	1/25	Italy		1,307.00						1,307.00
	1/25	1/27	Bulgaria		455.50						455.50
Commercial airfare							5,888.30		20.00		5,888.30
Hon. Mark Kirk	1/9	1/11	Pakistan		426.00						426.00
	1/11	1/13	Afghanistan		120.00						120.00
	1/13	1/17	India		594.00						594.00
Commercial airfare							8,291.77		414.22		8,291.77
Loretta Beaumont	1/15	1/22	Mexico		1,200.00						1,200.00
Commercial airfare							1,722.06		153.52		1,722.06
Alice Hogans	1/28	1/30	Jamaica		659.00						659.00
Commercial airfare							1,147.33				1,147.33
Hon. Roger Wicker	2/15	2/20	South Africa		1,220.00						1,220.00
	2/20	2/24	Tanzania		1,024.00						1,024.00
Commercial airfare							9,051.43				9,051.43
Hon. Jim Kolbe	2/15	2/16	Atlanta, GA		127.17						127.17
	2/17	2/20	South Africa		684.00						684.00
	2/20	2/24	Tanzania		1,024.00						1,024.00
Commercial airfare							9,285.38				9,285.38
Hon. Nita M. Lowey	2/15	2/20	South Africa		1,220.00						1,220.00
	2/20	2/24	Tanzania		1,024.00						1,024.00
Commercial airfare							8,860.93				8,860.93
Mark Murray	2/15	2/20	South Africa		1,220.00						1,220.00
	2/20	2/24	Tanzania		1,024.00						1,024.00
Commercial airfare							9,051.43				9,051.43
Maureen Holohan	2/13	2/21	New Zealand		2,208.00						2,208.00
Commercial airfare							6,997.50				6,997.50
Hon. Jim Kolbe	2/6	2/8	Germany		808.00		(³)				808.00
Hon. Mike Ringle	2/18	2/22	Liberia		950.00						950.00
Commercial airfare							8,980.98				8,980.98
Hon. John E. Sweeney	2/12	2/14	Italy		400.00						400.00
	2/15	2/16	Jordan		476.00		(³)				476.00
Part Commercial airfare							851.10				851.10
Hon. Joe Knollenberg	2/14	2/18	France		1,832.00						1,832.00
Commercial airfare							7,130.57				7,130.57
Hon. James T. Walsh	2/14	2/17	Denmark		939.00						939.00
	2/17	2/19	Ireland		962.00						962.00
	2/19	2/21	Norway		672.00						672.00
Loretta Beaumont ⁵	2/20	2/21	Costa Rica		186.87						186.87
									26.00		26.00
							37.50				37.50
Hon. C.W. Bill Young	3/12	3/16	Italy		673.00		(³)				673.00
Douglas Gregory	3/12	3/16	Italy		673.00		(³)				673.00
David Jolly	3/12	3/16	Italy		673.00		(³)				673.00
Hon. Joseph K. Knollenberg	3/19	3/20	Jordan		174.00						174.00
	3/20	3/22	Kuwait		666.00						666.00
	3/22	3/23	Germany		366.00		(³)				366.00
Hon. Chet Edwards	3/19	3/20	Jordan		174.00						174.00
	3/20	3/22	Kuwait		666.00						666.00
	3/22	3/23	Germany		366.00		(³)				366.00
Hon. Roger Wicker	3/19	3/20	Jordan		174.00						174.00
	3/20	3/22	Kuwait		666.00						666.00
	3/22	3/23	Germany		366.00		(³)				366.00
Carol Murphy	3/19	3/20	Jordan		174.00						174.00
	3/20	3/22	Kuwait		666.00						666.00
	3/22	3/23	Germany		366.00		(³)				366.00
Walter Hearne	3/19	3/20	Jordan		174.00						174.00
	3/20	3/22	Kuwait		666.00						666.00
	3/22	3/23	Germany		366.00		(³)				366.00
Valerie Baldwin	3/19	3/20	Jordan		174.00						174.00
	3/20	3/22	Kuwait		666.00						666.00
	3/22	3/23	Germany		366.00		(³)				366.00
Tom Forhan	3/19	3/20	Jordan		174.00						174.00
	3/20	3/22	Kuwait		666.00						666.00
	3/22	3/23	Germany		366.00		(³)				366.00
Total					56,909.54		127,477.79		774.74		185,162.07
Thomas K. Baker	2/29	3/2	Costa Rica		406.50		3,271.94		216.55		3,894.99
	3/2	3/4	Colombia		350.00						350.00
	3/4	3/6	Mexico		576.00						576.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Carroll L. Hauver	2/29	3/2	Costa Rica		406.50		3,271.94		189.24		3,867.68
	3/2	3/4	Colombia		350.00						350.00
	3/4	3/6	Mexico		576.00						576.00
Robert H. Pearre, Jr	2/29	3/2	Costa Rica		434.75		2,739.50		210.06		3,384.31
	3/2	3/4	Colombia		393.75						393.75
Committee totals					3,493.50		9,283.38		615.85		13,392.73

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.⁴ Part military air transportation.⁵ In country for non-government paid conference; expenses paid for Costa Rica by Department of Interior.

BILL YOUNG, Chairman, Apr. 28, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Israel and the United Kingdom, Jan. 5–10, 2004:											
Hon. Jim Saxton	1/5	1/8	Israel		1,092.00						1,092.00
	1/8	1/10	United Kingdom		874.00						874.00
Commercial airfare							7,546.59				7,546.59
Hon. Jo Ann Davis	1/5	1/8	Israel		1,092.00						1,092.00
	1/8	1/10	United Kingdom		874.00						874.00
Commercial airfare							7,546.59				7,546.59
Hon. Michael Turner	1/5	1/8	Israel		1,092.00						1,092.00
	1/8	1/10	United Kingdom		874.00						874.00
Commercial airfare							7,546.59				7,546.59
Hon. Jim Cooper	1/5	1/8	Israel		1,092.00						1,092.00
	1/8	1/10	United Kingdom		874.00						874.00
Commercial airfare							7,546.59				7,546.59
Thomas E. Hawley	1/5	1/8	Israel		1,092.00						1,092.00
	1/8	1/10	United Kingdom		874.00						874.00
Commercial airfare							7,546.59				7,546.59
William H. Natter	1/5	1/8	Israel		1,092.00						1,092.00
	1/8	1/10	United Kingdom		874.00						874.00
Commercial airfare							7,546.59				7,546.59
Visit to Russia, Jan. 10–17, 2004:											
Erin C. Conaton	1/10	1/17	Russia		1,700.00						1,700.00
Commercial airfare							5,712.50				5,712.50
Visit to Kuwait, Iraq, Kyrgyzstan and Italy with Codel Hobson, Jan. 12–16, 2004:											
Hon. John B. Larson	1/12	1/14	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
	1/13	1/13	Iraq (day trip)								
	1/14	1/15	Kyrgyzstan		235.00						235.00
	1/15	1/16	Italy		367.00						367.00
Visit to Jordan, Iraq and Germany, Jan. 15–18, 2004:											
Hon. James R. Langevin	1/15	1/17	Jordan		476.00						476.00
	1/16	1/16	Iraq (day trip)								
	1/17	1/18	Germany		67.45						67.45
Mr. Richard I. Stark	1/15	1/17	Jordan		476.00						476.00
	1/16	1/16	Iraq (day trip)								
	1/17	1/18	Germany		94.78						94.78
Mr. Dudley L. Tademy	1/15	1/17	Jordan		476.00						476.00
	1/16	1/16	Iraq (day trip)								
	1/17	1/18	Germany		94.78						94.78
Visit to Libya, Kuwait, Iraq, Pakistan, Uzbekistan and Germany, Jan. 25–31, 2004:											
Hon. Curt Weldon	1/25	1/26	Libya		72.00						72.00
	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
	1/27	1/28	Iraq (day trips)								
	1/29	1/29	Pakistan		263.00						263.00
	1/29	1/30	Uzbekistan								
	1/30	1/31	Germany		200.00						200.00
Hon. Solomon P. Ortiz	1/25	1/26	Libya		72.00						72.00
	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
	1/27	1/28	Iraq (day trips)								
	1/29	1/29	Pakistan		263.00						263.00
	1/29	1/30	Uzbekistan								
	1/30	1/31	Germany		200.00						200.00
Hon. Candice S. Miller	1/25	1/26	Libya		72.00						72.00
	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
	1/27	1/28	Iraq (day trips)								
	1/29	1/29	Pakistan		263.00						263.00
	1/29	1/30	Uzbekistan								
	1/30	1/31	Germany		200.00						200.00
Hon. Steve Israel	1/26	1/29	Kuwait		1,206.00						1,206.00
	1/27	1/28	Iraq (day trips)		804.00						804.00
Commercial airfare							5,192.27				5,192.27
Hon. Rodney Alexander	1/25	1/26	Libya		72.00						72.00
	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
	1/27	1/28	Iraq (day trips)								
	1/29	1/29	Pakistan		263.00						263.00
	1/29	1/30	Uzbekistan								
	1/30	1/31	Germany		200.00						200.00
Douglas C. Roach	1/25	1/26	Libya		72.00						72.00
	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
	1/27	1/28	Iraq (day trips)								
	1/29	1/29	Pakistan		263.00						263.00
	1/29	1/30	Uzbekistan								
	1/30	1/31	Germany		200.00						200.00
Harald O. Stavenas	1/25	1/26	Libya		72.00						72.00
	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
	1/27	1/28	Iraq (day trips)								
	1/29	1/29	Pakistan		263.00						263.00
	1/29	1/30	Uzbekistan								

May 17, 2004

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H3085

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Germany with Codel McCain, Feb. 6–8, 2004: Hon. Ellen O. Tauscher.	1/30	1/31	Germany		200.00						200.00
Visit to Kuwait, Iraq, and Germany, Feb. 6–9, 2004:	2/6	2/8	Germany		808.00						808.00
Hon. Duncan Hunter	2/6	2/8	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
	2/7	2/8	Iraq (day trips)								
Hon. Jim Saxton	2/8	2/9	Germany		189.00						189.00
	2/6	2/8	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
	2/7	2/8	Iraq (day trips)								
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	2/8	2/9	Germany		189.00						189.00
	2/6	2/8	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
	2/7	2/8	Iraq (day trips)								
Robert S. Rangel	2/8	2/9	Germany		189.00						189.00
	2/6	2/8	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
	2/7	2/8	Iraq (day trips)								
Robert L. Simmons	2/8	2/9	Germany		189.00						189.00
	2/6	2/8	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
	2/7	2/8	Iraq (day trips)								
Debra S. Wada	2/8	2/9	Germany		189.00						189.00
	2/6	2/8	Kuwait		804.00						804.00
	2/7	2/8	Iraq (day trips)								
Delegation expenses	2/8	2/9	Germany		189.00						189.00
	2/6	2/8	Kuwait				237.24		1,734.22		1,971.46
Visit to Ecuador and Colombia, Feb. 14–18, 2004: Hon. Gene Taylor	2/14	2/16	Ecuador		409.00						409.00
	2/16	2/18	Colombia		675.00						675.00
Commercial airfare							2,130.50				2,130.50
William H. Natter	2/14	2/16	Ecuador		409.00						409.00
	2/16	2/18	Colombia		675.00						675.00
Commercial airfare							1,928.50				1,928.50
Visit to Qatar, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Kuwait, Feb. 16–20, 2004: Hon. John M. McHugh	1/16	2/17	Qatar		130.00						130.00
	2/17	2/19	Pakistan		526.00						526.00
	2/17	2/19	Afghanistan (day trips)								
	2/19	2/20	Kuwait		402.00						402.00
Commercial airfare							7,385.75				7,385.75
Visit to Libya, Mar. 1–3, 2004: Hon. Curt Weldon	3/1	3/3	Libya		373.00						373.00
Hon. Solomon P. Ortiz	3/1	3/3	Libya		373.00						373.00
Hon. Silvestre Reyes	3/1	3/3	Libya		373.00						373.00
Hon. Susan Davis	3/1	3/3	Libya		373.00						373.00
Douglas C. Roach	3/1	3/3	Libya		373.00						373.00
Harald O. Stavenas	3/1	3/3	Libya		373.00						373.00
Erin Conaton	3/1	3/3	Libya		373.00						373.00
Visit to Canada, Mar. 16, 2004: Robert S. Simmons	3/16	3/16	Canada		10.59						10.59
Commercial airfare							1,402.59				1,402.59
Committee total					39,244.60		69,268.89		1,734.22		110,247.71

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DUNCAN HUNTER, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Henry Brown	1/4	1/6	Jordan		467.00						
	1/6	1/9	Israel		724.00						
Hon. Dennis Moore	1/4	1/6	Jordan		467.00						
	1/6	1/9	Israel		724.00						
Sean Spicer	1/4	1/6	Jordan		467.00						
	1/6	1/9	Israel		724.00						
Committee totals					3,573.00						3,573.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

JIM NUSSLE, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEE

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOHN BOEHNER, Chairman, May 3, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nathan Deal	2/14	2/17	Denmark		939.00						939.00
	2/17	2/19	Ireland		962.00						962.00
	2/19	2/21	Norway		672.00						672.00
Hon. Darrell Issa	1/25	1/27	Libya		266.00						266.00
	1/26	1/27	Tunisia		211.00		3,387.60				3,598.60
Hon. Mike Ferguson	1/15	1/17	Jordan		476.00						476.00
	1/16	1/16	Iraq								
	1/17	1/18	Germany		94.78						94.78
Hon. James Greenwood	1/4	1/6	Jordan		467.00						467.00
	1/5	1/5	Iraq								
	1/6	1/9	Israel		724.00						724.00
James Barnette, Staff	1/13	1/17	England		1,748.00		5,872.53				7,620.53
Committee total					6,559.78		9,260.13				15,819.91

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JOE BARTON.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Shelley Moore Capito	2/16	2/17	Kuwait		804.00		(³)				804.00
	2/19	2/20	Pakistan		526.00		(³)				526.00
Hon. Barbara Matthews	2/15	2/22	China		979.00		5,631.00		159.00		6,769.00
Committee total					2,309.00		5,631.00		159.00		8,099.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mark Souder	1/25	1/26	Libya		72.00						
	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		804.00						
	1/27	1/28	Iraq								
	1/29	1/29	Pakistan		263.00						
	1/29	1/30	Uzbekistan								
	1/30	1/31	Germany		200.00						
Marc Wheat	1/27	1/28	Kuwait		804.00		3,680.28				
	1/27	1/28	Iraq								
	1/29	1/29	Pakistan		263.00						
	1/29	1/30	Uzbekistan								
	1/30	1/31	Germany		200.00						
Hon. Ron Lewis	2/6	2/8	Kuwait		804.00						
	2/8	2/9	Germany		189.00						
James Moore	2/14	2/19	Beijing		1,247.00		6,931.50				
David young	2/14	2/19	Beijing		1,247.00		6,931.50				
Hon. Chris Shays	1/4	1/6	Jordan		467.00						
	1/6	1/9	Israel		724.00						
Lawrence Halloran	1/4	1/6	Jordan		467.00						
	1/6	1/9	Israel		724.00						
Nicholas Palarino	1/4	1/6	Jordan		467.00						
	1/6	1/9	Israel		724.00						
Hon. Tom Davis	2/16	2/18	Kuwait		804.00						
	2/19	2/20	Pakistan		526.00						
Hon. Carolyn Maloney	2/16	2/18	Kuwait		804.00						
	2/19	2/20	Pakistan		526.00						
Hon. John Carter	2/16	2/18	Kuwait		804.00						
	2/19	2/20	Pakistan		526.00						
Hon. Chris Van Hollen	2/16	2/18	Kuwait		804.00						
	2/19	2/20	Pakistan		526.00						
John Cuaderes	2/16	2/18	Kuwait		804.00						
	2/19	2/20	Pakistan		526.00						
Ron Martinson	2/16	2/18	Kuwait		804.00						
	2/19	2/20	Pakistan		526.00						
David Rapallo	2/16	2/18	Kuwait		804.00						
	2/19	2/20	Pakistan		526.00						
Robert Borden	2/16	2/18	Kuwait		804.00						
	2/19	2/20	Pakistan		526.00						
David Young	1/11	1/13	Mexico		288.00		2,289.82				
	1/13	1/15	Costa Rica		450.00						
Michael Yeager	1/11	1/13	Mexico		288.00		2,284.32				
	1/13	1/15	Costa Rica		450.00						
Joshua Sharfstein	3/27	3/31	Botswana		570.85		2,701.88				
Committee total					22,352.85		24,819.30				47,172.15

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TOM DAVIS, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2004.

May 17, 2004

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H3087

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Abramowitz, David	1/5	1/7	Bahrain		176.00						176.00
	1/7	1/9	Qatar		348.00						348.00
	1/9	1/10	Kuwait		312.00						312.00
	1/10	1/14	Saudi Arabia		200.00						200.00
	1/5	1/14					\$ 6,960.79				6,960.79
David Adams	1/5	1/7	Bahrain		236.00						236.00
	1/7	1/9	Qatar		368.00						368.00
	1/9	1/10	Kuwait		252.00						252.00
	1/10	1/14	Saudi Arabia		300.00						300.00
	1/5	1/14					\$ 6,960.79				6,960.79
	2/13	2/15	Egypt		384.00						384.00
	2/15	2/19	Israel		1,148.00						1,148.00
	2/13	2/19					\$ 6,254.67				6,254.67
Lara Alameh	1/5	1/7	Bahrain		336.00						336.00
	1/7	1/9	Qatar		368.00						368.00
	1/9	1/10	Kuwait		282.00						282.00
	1/10	1/14	Saudi Arabia		30.00						30.00
	1/5	1/14					\$ 6,960.79				6,960.79
	2/13	2/15	Egypt		434.00						434.00
	2/15	2/21	Israel		1,248.00						1,248.00
	2/13	2/21					\$ 6,254.67				6,254.67
Douglass Anderson	1/2	1/8	Vietnam		1,122.00						1,122.00
	1/8	1/11	Cambodia		675.00						675.00
	1/11	1/13	Thailand		109.00						109.00
	1/2	1/13					\$ 6,757.26				6,757.26
Renee Austell	1/9	1/11	India		396.00						396.00
	1/11	1/14	Nepal		460.00						460.00
	1/15	1/17	Sri Lanka		319.00						319.00
	1/9	1/17					\$ 7,709.28				7,709.28
Patrick Brennan	2/18	2/22	Panama		792.00		2,042.50				2,834.50
Hon. Dan Burton	2/27	3/1	Kuwait		1,206.00						1,206.00
	3/1	3/2	France		458.00		(?)				458.00
Malik Chaka	1/6	1/9	Guinea		426.00						426.00
	1/9	1/14	Liberia		786.00						786.00
	1/14	1/17	Ivory Coast		588.00						588.00
	1/6	1/17				\$ 6,214.99					6,214.99
Joan Condon	1/6	1/9	Guinea		426.00						426.00
	1/9	1/14	Liberia		786.00						786.00
	1/14	1/17	Ivory Coast		588.00						588.00
	1/6	1/17				\$ 6,214.99					6,214.99
David Fite	1/9	1/11	Pakistan		526.00						526.00
	1/13	1/14	United Arab Emirates		209.00						209.00
	1/9	1/14					\$ 7,452.54				7,452.54
	2/15	2/16	United Kingdom		457.00						457.00
	2/16	2/18	France		816.00						816.00
	2/18	2/21	Austria		819.00						819.00
	2/15	2/21					\$ 2,092.00				2,092.00
Hon. Jeff Flake	2/27	3/1	Kuwait		1,206.00						1,206.00
	3/1	3/2	France		458.00		(?)				458.00
Dan Freeman	2/28	3/5	Chile		780.00		5,801.42				6,581.42
Hon. Elton Gallegly	1/25	1/27	Tunisia		211.00						211.00
Kirsti Garlock	2/17	2/18	Ireland		431.00		(?)				431.00
	2/18	2/19	United Kingdom		259.00						259.00
	2/19	2/22	Italy		1,290.00						1,290.00
	2/17	2/22					\$ 5,249.72				5,249.72
Kristen Gilley	1/9	1/11	India		396.00						396.00
	1/11	1/14	Nepal		383.00						383.00
	1/15	1/17	Sri Lanka		484.00						484.00
	1/9	1/17					\$ 8,746.28				8,746.28
Dennis Halpin	1/10	1/13	Taiwan		834.00						834.00
	1/13	1/18	Japan		1,532.00						1,532.00
	1/10	1/18					\$ 7,085.73				7,085.73
Hans Hogrefe	1/9	1/11	India		396.00						396.00
	1/11	1/14	Nepal		453.00						453.00
	1/15	1/18	Sri Lanka		489.13						489.13
	1/9	1/18					\$ 7,666.55				7,666.55
Hon. Amo Houghton	2/15	2/18	France		1,374.00						1,374.00
Jonathan Katz	2/16	2/18	Belgium		784.00		5,701.05				6,485.05
	2/23	2/24	Netherlands		322.00		6,547.79				6,869.79
Kenneth Katzman	2/27	3/1	Kuwait		1,206.00						1,206.00
	3/1	3/2	France		458.00						458.00
David Killion	1/7	1/8	Thailand		182.00						182.00
	1/8	1/11	Cambodia		675.00						675.00
	1/11	1/14	Thailand		400.00						400.00
	1/14	1/18	Sri Lanka		504.00						504.00
	1/7	1/18					\$ 8,564.89				8,564.89
Robert King	1/24	1/26	Libya		600.00						600.00
	1/26	1/27	Netherlands		300.00						300.00
	1/24	1/27					\$ 8,595.85				8,595.85
Hon. Tom Lantos	1/24	1/26	Libya		600.00						600.00
	1/26	1/27	Netherlands		300.00						300.00
	1/24	1/27					\$ 8,595.85				8,595.85
Hon. James Leach	1/25	1/28	Sweden		1,035.00						1,035.00
	1/28	1/31	Ireland		1,302.01						1,302.01
	1/25	1/31					\$ 4,473.19				4,473.19
Jessica Lewis	2/16	2/18	Bolivia		196.00						196.00
	2/18	2/20	Venezuela		396.00						396.00
	2/16	2/20					\$ 3,467.54				3,467.54
Caleb McCarry	2/16	2/18	Bolivia		216.00						216.00
	2/18	2/20	Venezuela		466.00						466.00
	2/16	2/20					\$ 3,123.38				3,123.38
James McCormick	1/2	1/8	Vietnam		1,062.00						1,062.00
	1/8	1/11	Cambodia		655.00						655.00
	1/11	1/14	Thailand		400.00						400.00
	1/15	1/18	Sri Lanka		484.00						484.00
	1/2	1/18					\$ 8,536.46				8,536.46
Hon. Thaddeus McCotter	3/1	3/3	Libya		340.00						340.00
John Mackey	1/9	1/11	Pakistan		526.00						526.00
	1/13	1/14	United Arab Emirates		209.00						209.00
	1/9	1/14					\$ 7,452.54				7,452.54
	2/16	2/18	Ireland		431.00						431.00
	2/18	2/19	United Kingdom		324.00						324.00
	2/19	2/22	Italy		1,290.00						1,290.00
	2/16	2/22					\$ 5,249.72				5,249.72
	3/13	3/16	Austria		800.00		4,104.55				4,904.55

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Alan Makovksy	1/5	1/7	Bahrain		176.00						176.00
	1/7	1/9	Qatar		368.00						368.00
	1/9	1/10	Kuwait		352.00						352.00
	1/10	1/14	Saudi Arabia		220.00						220.00
	1/5	1/26	Libya		200.00		4,960.79				6,960.79
	1/26	1/27	Netherlands		350.00						350.00
	1/24	1/27					4,595.85				8,595.85
Richard Mereu	1/25	1/27	Tunisia		211.00		(³)				211.00
Paul Oostburg-Sanz	2/16	2/18	Bolivia		216.00						216.00
	2/18	2/20	Venezuela		466.00						466.00
	2/16	2/20					4,3724.38				3,725.38
Hon. Mike Pence	2/27	3/1	Kuwait		1,206.00		2,926.00				4,132.00
Patrick Prisco	2/18	2/20	Austria		546.00		4,563.80				5,109.80
Frank Record	1/24	1/26	Libya		130.00						130.00
	1/26	1/17	Netherlands		171.00						171.00
	1/24	1/27					4,564.21				8,564.21
	2/14	2/22	China		1,717.00		7,060.50				8,777.50
Gregg Rickman	2/13	2/15	Egypt		391.00						391.00
	2/15	2/20	Israel		1,138.00						1,138.00
	2/13	2/20					4,6254.67				6,254.67
John Walker Roberts	1/2	1/8	Vietnam		1,122.00						1,122.00
	1/8	1/11	Cambodia		675.00						675.00
	1/2	1/11					4,616.74				6,616.74
Rotem Roizman	2/17	2/18	Ireland		431.00						431.00
	2/18	2/19	United Kingdom		324.00						324.00
	2/19	2/22	Italy		1,290.00						1,290.00
	2/17	2/22					4,5138.00				5,138.00
Jonathan Scharfen	1/9	1/11	Pakistan		526.00						526.00
	1/13	1/14	United Arab Emirates		209.00						209.00
	1/9	1/14					4,7452.54				7,452.54
Doug Seay	2/15	2/16	United Kingdom		457.00						457.00
	2/16	2/18	France		816.00						816.00
	2/18	2/21	Austria		659.00						659.00
	2/15	2/21					4,6240.50				6,240.50
Hon. Nick Smith	3/1	3/3	Libya		373.00		(³)				373.00
Sam Stratman	2/27	3/1	Kuwait		1,036.00						1,036.00
	3/1	3/2	France		458.00		(³)				458.00
Sarah Tillemann	1/10	1/13	Taiwan		734.00						734.00
	1/13	1/18	Japan		1,483.00						1,483.00
	1/10	1/18					4,7085.73				7,085.73
Hillel Weinberg	1/11	1/14	Bangladesh		402.00						402.00
	1/14	1/18	India		922.00						922.00
	1/11	1/18					4,7901.72				7,901.72
Hillel Weinberg	2/27	3/1	Kuwait		1,056.00						1,056.00
	3/1	3/2	France		408.00		(³)				408.00
Hon. Gerald Weller	1/13	1/15	Dominican Republic		426.00		1,636.40				2,062.40
	2/15	2/17	Trinidad		234.00				4,332.52		4,566.52
	2/17	2/19	Costa Rica		450.00						450.00
	2/19	2/22	Panama		519.00						519.00
	2/15	2/22					4,3131.60				3,131.60
Hon. Robert Wexler	2/16	2/18	Belgium		784.00		5,701.05				6,485.05
	2/23	2/24	Netherlands		322.00		6,547.79				6,869.79
Peter Yeo	1/2	1/8	Vietnam		1,122.00		6,335.74				7,457.74
	1/24	1/26	Libya		600.00						600.00
	1/26	1/27	Netherlands		300.00						300.00
	1/24	1/27					8,595.85				8,595.85
Committee total					71,821.14		301,871.64		4,332.52		378,025.30

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.⁴ Round trip airfare.⁵ Indicates Delegation costs.

HENRY HYDE, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 4 AND FEB. 21, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner	1/4	1/13	China		2,341.00		5,236.36				7,577.36
Philip J. Kiko	1/4	1/13	China		2,341.00		5,236.36				7,577.36
George Fishman	2/15	2/22	Mexico		1,656.00		2,176.62				3,832.62
Brian Zimmer	2/15	2/22	Mexico		1,656.00		2,176.62				3,832.62
Stacey Dansky	2/15	2/22	Mexico		1,656.00		2,176.62				3,832.62
Danielle Brown	2/15	2/22	Mexico		1,656.00		2,176.62				3,832.62
Committee total					11,306.00		19,179.20				30,485.20

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., Chairman, Apr. 21, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Richard Pombo	1/13	1/14	Marshall Islands		225.00		(³)				225.00
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	1/13	1/14	Marshall Islands		225.00		(³)				225.00
Hon. Dennis Cardoza	1/13	1/14	Marshall Islands		225.00		(³)				225.00
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	1/13	1/14	Marshall Islands		225.00		(³)				225.00
Hon. Jeff Flake	1/13	1/14	Marshall Islands		225.00		(³)				225.00

May 17, 2004

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H3089

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Frank Lucas	1/13	1/14	Marshall Islands		225.00		(³)				225.00
Hon. Denny Rehberg	1/13	1/14	Marshall Islands		225.00		(³)				225.00
Steve Ding	1/13	1/14	Marshall Islands		225.00		(³)				225.00
Tony Babauta	1/13	1/14	Marshall Islands		225.00		(³)				225.00
Chris Wallace	1/13	1/14	Marshall Islands		225.00		(³)				225.00
Lisa Wallace	1/13	1/14	Marshall Islands		225.00		(³)				225.00
Hon. Richard Pombo	1/14	1/15	Micronesia		325.00		(³)				325.00
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	1/14	1/15	Micronesia		325.00		(³)				325.00
Hon. Dennis Cardoza	1/15	1/15	Micronesia		325.00		(³)				325.00
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	1/14	1/15	Micronesia		325.00		(³)				325.00
Hon. Jeff Flake	1/14	1/15	Micronesia		325.00		(³)				325.00
Hon. Frank Lucas	1/14	1/15	Micronesia		325.00		(³)				325.00
Hon. Dennis Rehberg	1/14	1/15	Micronesia		325.00		(³)				325.00
Steve Ding	1/14	1/15	Micronesia		325.00		(³)				325.00
Tony Babauta	1/14	1/15	Micronesia		325.00		(³)				325.00
Chris Foster	1/14	1/15	Micronesia		325.00		(³)				325.00
Chris Wallace	1/14	1/15	Micronesia		325.00		(³)				325.00
Lisa Wallace	1/14	1/15	Micronesia		325.00		(³)				325.00
Todd Willens	3/15	3/19	Switzerland		1,212.00		5,743.79				6,955.79
Committee total					7,262.00		5,743.79				13,005.79

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

RICHARD POMBO, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Doc Hastings	3/19	3/20	Jordan		174.00		(³)				174.00
	3/20	3/23	Kuwait		666.00		(³)				666.00
	3/22	3/23	Germany		366.00		(³)				366.00
George Rogers	1/13	1/17	London		1,748.00		5,872.53				7,620.53
Ed Cassidy	1/13	1/17	London		1,748.00		5,872.53				7,620.53
Susan McAvoy	1/13	1/17	London		1,748.00		5,872.53				7,620.53
Committee totals					6,450.00		17,617.59				24,067.59

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military Air Transportation.

DAVID DREIER, Chairman, Apr. 27, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Ken Kellner	2/15	2/19	Latvia		949.50		2,229.20			(³)	3,178.70
Committee total					3,178.70						3,178.70

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ All funding for this trip was provided by the Department of Justice/OPDAT.

JOEL HEFLEY, Chairman, Apr. 27, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John Duncan	1/22	1/24	Jordan		714.00		(³)				714.00
Hon. Jerry Costello	1/22	1/24	Jordan		714.00		(³)				714.00
Hon. Peter DeFazio	1/22	1/24	Jordan		714.00		(³)				714.00
Hon. Steve LaTourette	1/22	1/24	Jordan		714.00		(³)				714.00
Hon. John Boozman	1/22	1/24	Jordan		714.00		(³)				714.00
Hon. John Sullivan	1/22	1/24	Jordan		714.00		(³)				714.00
Jimmy Miller	1/22	1/24	Jordan		714.00		(³)				714.00
Susan Bodine	1/22	1/24	Jordan		714.00		(³)				714.00
John Cullather	1/22	1/24	Jordan		714.00		(³)				714.00
Hon. John Duncan	1/25	1/27	Morocco		753.00		(³)				753.00
Hon. Jerry Costello	1/25	1/27	Morocco		753.00		(³)				753.00
Hon. Peter DeFazio	1/25	1/27	Morocco		753.00		(³)				753.00
Hon. Steve LaTourette	1/25	1/27	Morocco		753.00		(³)				753.00
Hon. John Boozman	1/25	1/27	Morocco		753.00		(³)				753.00
Hon. John Sullivan	1/25	1/27	Morocco		753.00		(³)				753.00
John Miller	1/25	1/27	Morocco		753.00		(³)				753.00
Susan Bodine	1/25	1/27	Morocco		753.00		(³)				753.00
John Cullather	1/25	1/27	Morocco		753.00		(³)				753.00
John Pawlow	2/8	2/14	London		2,742.00		5,873.20				8,615.20
John Cullather	2/8	2/14	London		2,742.00		5,873.20				8,615.20
Hon. Mark Kennedy	2/14	2/16	Hungary		508.00		4,542.51				5,050.51
	2/17	2/17	Bosnia		151.00						151.00
	2/18	2/18	Albania		54.00						54.00
Hon. Jim Oberstar	2/14	2/15	Amsterdam		327.00						327.00
	2/16	2/19	Paris		1,374.00		2,972.18				4,346.18

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Tom Petri	2/16	2/19	Paris		1,374.00		3,209.40				4,583.40
Hon. Michael Burgess	2/16	2/18	Kuwait		804.00		(³)				804.00
	2/19	2/20	Pakistan		526.00						526.00
Hon. Lincoln Davis	2/27	3/1	Kuwait		1,206.00		(³)				1,206.00
	3/1	3/2	France		458.00						458.00
Committee total					25,469.00		22,470.49				47,939.49

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Wally Herger	2/14	2/17	Denmark		789.00		(³)				789.00
	2/17	2/17	Belgium				(³)				
	2/17	2/19	Ireland		862.00		(³)				862.00
	2/19	2/21	Norway		572.00		(³)				572.00
Hon. Nancy Johnson	2/14	2/18	France		2,317.00		1,075.09				3,392.09
Hon. J. D. Hayworth	3/19	3/20	Jordan		174.00		(³)				174.00
	3/20	3/22	Iraq/Kuwait		666.00		(³)				666.00
	3/22	3/23	Germany		366.00		(³)				366.00
Committee total					5,746.00		1,075.09				6,821.09

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

BILL THOMAS, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. James Gibbons	1/6	1/8	Southeast Asia		358.00						
	1/8	1/10	Southeast Asia		735.00						
Commercial airfare							7,412.32				8,505.32
Brant Bassett	1/6	1/8	Southeast Asia		358.00						
			Southeast Asia		735.00						
Commercial airfare							9,095.78				10,188.78
Merrell Moorhead	1/6	1/8	Southeast Asia		358.00						
	1/8	1/10	Southeast Asia		735.00						
Commercial airfare							11,628.48				12,721.48
Michael Kostiw	1/6	1/8	Southeast Asia		358.00						
	1/8	1/10	Southeast Asia		735.00						
Commercial airfare							9,540.97				10,633.97
Patrick Murray	1/6	1/9	Central Europe		954.00						
Commercial airfare							4,203.00				5,157.00
Michael Fogarty	1/6	1/9	Central Europe		954.00						
Commercial airfare							6,261.13				7,215.13
Riley Perdue	1/8	1/15	Asia		2,240.00						
	1/15	1/17	Asia		734.00						
Commercial airfare							5,964.23				8,938.23
Michele Lang	1/8	1/11	Middle East		992.00		(³)				
	1/11	1/12	Middle East		130.75		(³)				
											1,122.75
Hon. Collin C. Peterson	1/9	1/19	Central & South America		2,312.000						
Commercial airfare							5,793.00				8,105.00
Patrick Murray	1/11	1/15	Europe		1,748.00						
Commercial airfare							5,870.95				7,618.95
Merrell Moorhead	1/11	1/15	Europe		1,748.00						
Commercial airfare							5,870.95				7,618.95
Robert Myhill	1/11	1/15	Europe		1,748.00						
Commercial airfare							5,870.95				7,618.95
Hon. Jane Harman	2/5	2/8	Europe		844.00		(³)				844.00
Hon. Sherwood Boehlert	2/13	2/14	Europe		209.00		(³)				
	2/14	2/16	Middle East		406.50		(³)				
	2/17	2/18	Middle East		333.00		(³)				
	2/18	2/18	Middle East		233.00		(³)				
Hon. James Gibbons	2/13	2/14	Europe		209.00						
	2/14	2/16	Middle East		406.50						
Commercial airfare							5,053.95				5,669.45
Hon. Peter Hoekstra	2/13	2/14	Europe		209.00		(³)				
	2/14	2/16	Middle East		406.50		(³)				
	2/17	2/18	Middle East		333.00		(³)				
Hon. Jane Harman	2/13	2/14	Middle East		209.00						
	2/14	2/16	Middle East		406.50						
	2/17	2/18	Middle East		333.00						
	2/18	2/18	Middle East		233.00						
Hon. Dutch Ruppersberger	2/13	2/14	Middle East		209.00		(³)				
	2/14	2/16	Middle East		406.50		(³)				
	2/17	2/18	Middle East		333.00		(³)				
	2/18	2/18	Middle East		233.00		(³)				
Michael Kostiw	2/13	2/14	Middle East		209.00		(³)				
	2/14	2/16	Middle East		406.50		(³)				
	2/17	2/18	Middle East		333.00		(³)				
	2/18	2/18	Middle East		233.00		(³)				
Brant Bassett	2/13	2/14	Europe		209.00		(³)				
	2/14	2/16	Middle East		406.50		(³)				
	2/17	2/18	Middle East		333.00		(³)				

May 17, 2004

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H3091

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Michele Lang	2/18	2/18	Middle East		233.00		(³)				1,181.50
	2/13	2/14	Europe		209.00		(³)				
	2/14	2/16	Middle East		406.50		(³)				
	2/17	2/18	Middle East		333.00		(³)				
Kevin Schmidt	2/18	2/18	Middle East		233.00		(³)				1,181.50
	2/13	2/14	Europe		209.00		(³)				
	2/14	2/16	Middle East		406.50		(³)				
	2/17	2/18	Middle East		333.00		(³)				
John Keefe	2/18	2/18	Middle East		233.00		(³)				1,181.50
	2/13	2/14	Europe		209.00		(³)				
	2/14	2/16	Middle East		406.50		(³)				
	2/17	2/18	Middle East		333.00		(³)				
Suzanne Spaulding	2/18	2/18	Middle East		233.00		(³)				1,181.50
	2/13	2/14	Europe		209.00		(³)				
	2/14	2/16	Middle East		406.50		(³)				
	2/17	2/18	Middle East		333.00		(³)				
Hon. Mac Collins	2/18	2/18	Middle East		233.00		(³)				1,181.50
Commercial airfare	2/22	2/28	Asia		1,109.00						
Brant Bassett					1,109.00		4,144.50				5,253.50
Commercial airfare	2/22	2/28	Asia		1,109.00		4,959.50				6,068.50
Hon. Collin C. Peterson	2/15	2/21	Central America		1,908.00		2,465.00				4,373.00
Commercial airfare	2/16	2/20	Europe		1,920.00		6,413.15				8,333.15
Patrick Murray	2/16	2/20	Europe		1,920.00		6,413.15				8,333.15
Merrell Moorhead	2/16	2/20	Europe		1,920.00		6,413.15				8,333.15
Commercial airfare	3/11	3/13	North America		676.00		556.91				1,232.91
Brant Bassett	3/11	3/13	North America		676.00		556.91				1,232.91
Commercial airfare	3/12	3/15	Europe		2,542.00		5,604.01				8,146.01
Patrick Murray	3/12	3/15	Europe		2,542.00		5,604.01				8,146.01
Commercial airfare	3/12	3/15	Europe		2,542.00		5,604.01				8,146.01
Joseph Jakub	3/12	3/15	Europe		2,542.00		5,604.01				8,146.01
Commercial airfare	3/24	3/26	Europe		752.00		7,334.22				8,086.22
Brant Bassett											
Commercial airfare											
Committee total											129,234.96

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

PORTER GOSS, Chairman, May 5, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Christopher Cox	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Hon. Jennifer Dunn	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Hon. Sheila Jackson-Lee	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Hon. Bennie Thompson	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Hon. Donna Christensen	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Hon. Eleanor Holmes Norton	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
John Gannon	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Mandy Bowers	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Josh Weersinghe	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Julie Sund	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Mark Magee	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Scott Bates	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Jason McNamara	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Sue Ramanathan	2/29	2/29	Cuba				(³)				
Hon. Robert Andrews	1/3	1/6	Jordan		467.00		(³)				
	1/6	1/9	Israel		1,086.00		(³)				1,553.00
Committee total					1,553.00						1,553.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

CHRIS COX, Chairman, Apr. 20, 2004.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Michael Ochs		12/30	USA				6,770.00				6,770.00
	12/31	1/6	Georgia		1,019.00						1,019.00
	1/6	1/9	Azerbaijan		796.00						796.00
Janice Helwig		1/9	USA				5,572.00				5,572.00
	1/9	4/9	Austria		16,358.00						16,358.00
Knox Thames		2/8	USA				6,501.00				6,501.00
	2/9	2/11	Germany		595.00						595.00
Marlene Kaufmann		2/14	USA				6,434.00				6,434.00
	2/15	2/18	Ireland		1,443.00						1,443.00
	2/18	2/21	Austria		819.00						819.00
Elizabeth Pryor		2/17	USA				5,021.00				5,021.00
	2/18	2/22	Austria		435.00						435.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2004—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Dorothy Douglas Taft	2/22	2/24	Belgium		531.00						531.00
		2/18	USA				(³)				
	2/19	2/20	Austria		398.00						398.00
	2/20	2/22	Greece		440.00						440.00
	2/22	2/23	Belgium		333.00						333.00
Hon. Christopher Smith		2/18	USA				(³)				
	2/19	2/20	Austria		546.00						546.00
	2/20	2/22	Greece		266.00						266.00
	2/22	2/23	Belgium		342.00						342.00
Hon. Benjamin Cardin		2/18	USA				(³)				
	2/19	2/20	Austria		546.00						546.00
	2/20	2/22	Greece		266.00						266.00
	2/22	2/23	Belgium		342.00						342.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings		2/17	USA				5,930.00				5,930.00
	2/18	2/21	Austria		819.00						819.00
Chadwick Gore		2/18	USA				(³)				
	2/19	2/20	Austria		475.00						475.00
	2/20	2/25	Greece		1,124.00		3,716.00				4,840.00
Elizabeth Pryor		2/28	USA				4,541.00				4,541.00
	2/29	3/3	France		1,145.00						1,145.00
	3/3	3/6	Belgium		754.00						754.00
	3/10	3/12	Austria		618.00						618.00
Maureen Walsh		3/2	USA				5,701.00				5,701.00
	3/3	3/6	Belgium		826.00						826.00
Ronald McNamara		3/23	USA				7,335.00				7,335.00
	3/24	3/29	Georgia		970.00						970.00
Michael Ochs		3/23	USA				7,424.00				7,424.00
	3/24	3/30	Georgia		1,087.00						1,087.00
	3/30	4/2	Azerbaijan		617.00						617.00
Committee total					38,057.00		60,798.00				98,855.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2004.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8166. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Procedures for Reestablishing a Region as Free of a Disease [Docket No. 02-001-2] (RIN: 0579-AB53) received May 11, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8167. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, APHIS, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Highly Pathogenic Avian Influenza; Additional Restrictions [Docket No. 04-011-1] received May 11, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

8168. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting request for a FY 2005 budget amendment to establish a contingent emergency reserve fund to support operations in Iraq and Afghanistan; (H. Doc. No. 108-185); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8169. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on activities and programs for countering proliferation and NBC terrorism, pursuant to Public Law 103-337, section 1503; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8170. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA-D-7555] received May 11, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8171. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations—received May 11, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8172. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received May 11, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8173. A letter from the Director, FDIC Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Risk-Based Capital Guidelines; Capital Adequacy Guidelines; Capital Maintenance: Interim Capital Treatment of Consolidated Asset-Backed Commercial Paper Program Assets; Extension (RIN: 3064-AC74); Department of the Treasury, Office of of the Comptroller of the Currency [Docket No. 04-] (RIN: 1557-AC76); Federal Reserve System [Regulations H and Y; Docket No. R-1156]; Department of the Treasury, Office of Thrift Supervision [No. 2004-] (RIN: 1550-AB79) received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

8174. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits—received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

8175. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting reports in accordance with Section 36(a) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

8176. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Kentucky Regulatory Program [KY-244-FOR] received May 7, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8177. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Oil Valuation (RIN: 1010-AD04) received May 10, 2004, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports and committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[The following reports were filed on May 14, 2004]

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 2432. A bill to amend the Paperwork Reduction Act and titles 5 and 31, United States Code, to reform Federal paperwork and regulatory processes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-490 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HUNTER. Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4200. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2005 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 2005, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 108-491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on May 17, 2004]

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia: Committee on Government Reform. Supplemental report on H.R. 2432. A bill to amend the Paperwork Reduction Act and titles 5 and 31, United States Code, to reform Federal paperwork and regulatory processes (Rept. 108-490, Pt. 2).

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2201. A bill to authorize the establishment of a national database for purposes of identifying, locating, and cataloging the many memorials and permanent tributes to America's veterans (Rept. 108-492, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3768. A bill to expand the Timucuan Ecological and Historic Preserve, Florida; with an amendment (Rept. 108-493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3505. A bill to amend the Bend Pine Nursery Land Conveyance Act to specify the recipients and consideration for conveyance of the Bend Pine Nursery, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POMBO: Committee on Resources. H.R. 265. A bill to provide for an adjustment of the boundaries of Mount Rainier National Park, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 108-495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 644. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4359) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the child tax credit (Rept. 108-496). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 645. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2728) to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for the adjudicative flexibility with regard to an employer filing of a notice of contest following the issuance of a citation by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2729) to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for greater efficiency at the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission; for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2730) to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for an independent review of citations issued by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2731) to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for the award of attorney's fees and costs to very small employers when they prevail in litigation prompted by the issuance of citations by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2432) to amend the Paperwork Reduction Act and titles 5 and 31, United States Code, to reform Federal paperwork and regulatory processes. (Rept. 108-497). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action occurred on May 14, 2004]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on the Budget discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2432 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[The following actions occurred on May 17, 2004]

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on Veterans' Affairs discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2201 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2730 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 2731 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred on May 14, 2004]

H.R. 2432. Referral to the Committee on the Budget extended for a period ending not later than May 14, 2004.

[The following action occurred on May 17, 2004]

H.R. 2201. Referral to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs extended for a period ending not later than May 17, 2004.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PETRI (for himself and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 4370. A bill to ensure that the Direct Loan Program is a competitive alternative to the Federal Family Education Loan Program for schools and students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. LAHOOD (for himself, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. QUINN):

H.R. 4371. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce to make noninterest bearing loans to State and local governments solely for the purpose of funding capital projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CANTOR (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota):

H.R. 4372. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the carryforward of \$500 of unused benefits in cafeteria plans and flexible spending arrangements for dependent care assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAPUANO:

H.R. 4373. A bill to preserve the pre-eminence of the United States in scientific research by improving the Visas Mantis security check program through a reduction of processing times and improvement in efficiency under such program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINCHEY:

H.R. 4374. A bill to require Medicare providers to disclose publicly staffing and performance in order to promote improved consumer information and choice; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLT (for himself and Mr. MCHUGH):

H.R. 4375. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the battlefields of the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. KELLY (for herself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. MAJETTE, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 4376. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to establish funding priorities for women's business centers for fiscal year 2004; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. LANTOS,

Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FILNER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. LEE, Ms. DELAUNO, and Mr. SHAYS):

H.R. 4377. A bill to provide for the review by the Commissioner of Food and Drugs of the process by which the Food and Drug Administration made the decision not to approve the commercial distribution of the emergency-contraceptive drug Plan B as an over-the-counter drug, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FROST, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. LEE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. WATT, and Mr. SANDERS):

H. Con. Res. 427. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of Charles Hamilton Houston; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. HARMAN:

H. Con. Res. 428. Concurrent resolution recommending that Congress not provide funds for fiscal year 2005 for the deployment of ground-based, strategic, mid-course, ballistic missile defense system components that have not met operational testing requirements and, instead, provide needed funding for programs designed to keep America's ports secure from terrorist attacks; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CANNON (for himself, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. MCKEON):

H. Res. 643. A resolution congratulating the Brigham Young University men's volleyball team for winning the 2004 National Collegiate Athletic Association Division I-II men's volleyball championship; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio:

H. Res. 644. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4359) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the child tax credit.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Res. 645. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2728) to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for the adjudicative flexibility with regard to an employer filing of a notice of contest following the issuance of a citation by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2729) to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for greater efficiency at the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission; for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2730) to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for an independent review of citations issued by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2731) to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to provide for the award of attorney's fees and costs to very small employers when they prevail in litigation prompted by the issuance of

citations by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration; and for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2432) to amend the Paperwork Reduction Act and titles 5 and 31, United States Code, to reform Federal paperwork and regulatory processes.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. ANDREWS.
 H.R. 218: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 236: Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 577: Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 742: Mr. McDERMOTT.
 H.R. 811: Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 857: Mr. LAMPSON.
 H.R. 972: Mr. LEACH.
 H.R. 996: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. LAMPSON.
 H.R. 1043: Mr. HALL.
 H.R. 1080: Mr. PETRI.
 H.R. 1149: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 1288: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
 H.R. 1565: Mr. STARK.
 H.R. 1746: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HONDA, Mr. WU, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
 H.R. 1812: Ms. WATSON and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
 H.R. 2032: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 2151: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 2258: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
 H.R. 2527: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 2705: Mr. SHERWOOD.
 H.R. 2880: Mr. OSBORNE.
 H.R. 2901: Mr. TOWNS.
 H.R. 2950: Mr. NEY, Mr. BELL, and Mr. ISAKSON.
 H.R. 2983: Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 3023: Mr. KILDEE.
 H.R. 3085: Mr. PICKERING.
 H.R. 3142: Mr. GOSS, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3165: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 3178: Mr. BACHUS.
 H.R. 3192: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
 H.R. 3194: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. MEEK of Florida.
 H.R. 3340: Mr. HASTERT.
 H.R. 3350: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3355: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 3438: Mr. CAMP.
 H.R. 3458: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3459: Mr. OLVER.
 H.R. 3460: Mr. FEENEY and Mr. SAXTON.
 H.R. 3473: Mr. GOODLATTE.
 H.R. 3474: Mr. DAVIS of Alabama.
 H.R. 3476: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
 H.R. 3480: Mr. EMANUEL.
 H.R. 3519: Ms. DELAULO.
 H.R. 3591: Mr. FORD.
 H.R. 3593: Mr. DEUTSCH.
 H.R. 3619: Ms. HARMAN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. MARSHALL.
 H.R. 3684: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. REGULA.
 H.R. 3755: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. REHBERG, Mr. PLATTS, and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3779: Ms. MAJETTE.
 H.R. 3831: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3859: Mr. JOHN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 4023: Mr. BACA and Mr. CHANDLER.
 H.R. 4026: Mr. ISRAEL and Mr. HULSHOF.
 H.R. 4039: Mr. PLATTS and Mr. WYNN.
 H.R. 4067: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 4104: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
 H.R. 4116: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MOORE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BERRY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 4122: Mr. HINOJOSA.
 H.R. 4150: Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.R. 4155: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. ENGEL.
 H.R. 4156: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. MCHUGH.
 H.R. 4169: Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
 H.R. 4192: Mr. CLAY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CASE, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 4205: Mr. RENZI.
 H.R. 4233: Mr. MARKEY.
 H.R. 4256: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H.R. 4258: Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. FROST, Mr. MATSUI, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.
 H.R. 4260: Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California.
 H.R. 4284: Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, and Mr. CULBERSON.
 H.R. 4290: Mr. FILNER and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 4341: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 4343: Mr. SULLIVAN.
 H.R. 4346: Mr. OBEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILA, and Mr. ISRAEL.
 H.R. 4356: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 4359: Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. McCOTTER, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
 H. Con. Res. 163: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
 H. Con. Res. 261: Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. WYNN.
 H. Con. Res. 298: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. HENSARLING.
 H. Con. Res. 366: Ms. MAJETTE.
 H. Con. Res. 390: Ms. DELAULO, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. CULBERSON, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BONNER, and Mr. BOYD.
 H. Con. Res. 391: Mr. CHANDLER.
 H. Con. Res. 403: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.
 H. Con. Res. 413: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Ms. MAJETTE, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BELL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BEAUPREZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. FROST.
 H. Res. 471: Mr. ENGEL.
 H. Res. 550: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri and Mr. DICKS.
 H. Res. 640: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Ms. DELAULO.